

CA20N
SM 160
- T9D36

A Discussion Paper

Child Welfare in Ontario:

Past, Present and Future

A Study of Structure

and Relationships



Ministry of
Community and
Social Services

Children's
Services
Division

September 1979



Ministry of
Community and
Social Services

Office of the
Minister
416/965-2341

Hepburn Block
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1E9



1979 International
Year of the Child

Dear Friends:

I am pleased to release for discussion and reaction a background study of our child welfare structure, relationships, and future options.

About a year ago, with the assistance of the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, a provincial study group was established to review the structure and accountability relationships of the Children's Aid Societies and to assess the viability of various alternatives for the future. I believe that the study group has prepared a balanced document which should provide some clarity and focus to the on-going re-appraisal of the most appropriate locus of authority for child welfare services in Ontario.

Our commitment to developing a full spectrum of services for children with special needs, coupled with the projected delegation of responsibility to local governments through local children's services committees, necessitates a thorough review of every aspect of the present system in preparation for the future. This particular study was initiated largely as a result of longstanding concerns regarding the quasi-public structure of the Societies and criticism that the Societies are not adequately accountable either to the provincial and municipal governments which fund their services, or to the public whom they serve.

Among other things, the study assesses four alternatives for the provision of child welfare services: provincial administration, municipal administration, quasi-public administration, and local children's services committee administration. Each option is assessed according to its ability to reflect six characteristics: accountability, advocacy ability, coordination, effectiveness, availability and flexibility. The implications of each option and the possible effects of local children's services committees are also considered.

It is noted that each of the options demonstrates potential strengths in some features and weaknesses in others. There is no single, clean-cut answer. The study concludes that resolution of the issues related to structure and relationships is both necessary and overdue and urges the provincial government to take a position on the future of the Societies. It is suggested, however, that the choice of structural framework for services will not, in itself, solve all of the identified concerns or eliminate the inherent risks associated with child welfare. The quality of any system ultimately will depend not only on its structure but also on its philosophy, leadership, staff and resources.

Let me now assure you that the Provincial Government has no intention of transferring responsibility for the provision of child welfare services to any body other than the Societies. The Societies share a rich and enviable history of service to children. While it is true there are weaknesses in the system, the study clearly illustrates many problems are the result of ambiguity and lack of clarity rather than inherent defects in existing quasi-public arrangements.

CA20A
SM 160
-79D36

While there will be no transfer of authority for child welfare services at this time, we are nonetheless committed to a process of rationalization and decentralization of responsibility for children's services. As local children's services committees evolve and local needs are clearly defined, it may become necessary to re-examine the manner in which all services, including child welfare, are organized and provided on a local basis.

I hope that all those concerned with improving services to children and their families will carefully consider the findings of this study, not only as they relate to the Children's Aid Societies but to all private organizations serving children and their families. Reactions and response to the study will be shared with interested agencies and municipal organizations and incorporated into both our current and future activities. In particular, we would be interested in receiving comments on the following issues arising from the study:

- o What can realistically be expected from the child welfare system?
- o How can the Children's Services Division and our regional and area offices enhance communication with and support to Societies?
- o What responsibilities do the Societies have to the communities they serve?
- o What should be the role of voluntary Boards of Directors in the delivery of statutory services to children with special needs?
- o What effects will or should the introduction of provincial standards and guidelines and local children's services committees have on the functions of Boards of local agencies?
- o What should be the balance between the Ministry's need to prescribe certain policies and procedures and agencies' need to determine these within their own priorities? How can this balance be achieved?
- o For agencies funded by the Ministry, is consumer involvement a realistic principle and, if so, how can it be realized?

These questions are not intended to limit discussion but rather to focus it. We would also welcome descriptions of current activities aimed at implementing any of the concepts outlined in the study. For example, how can mechanisms for consumer complaints be established? What methods can be used to broaden representation on Society Boards?

Comments and observations may be directed to the Consultation Task Force, Children's Services Division, 700 Bay Street, 12th Floor, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1E9, and should be received no later than December 28, 1979. Written inquiries about the content of the study should be directed to Dr. Clive Chamberlain, Executive Coordinator, Program Policy, Children's Services Division, 700 Bay Street, 11th Floor, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1E9.

Finally, I would like to thank the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto and the members of the study group who prepared this document. Their contribution is a stimulating and thoughtful reminder of all the problems and possibilities which face us as we move into the future.

Yours very truly,



Keith C. Norton
Minister
M.P.P. Kingston & the Islands

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Study Group Members	
Acknowledgements	i
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
I The Study	1
A. Purpose and Background	
B. Context	
C. Need	
D. Limitations	
E. Methodology	
F. Contents	
II The Philosophy	7
<u>PART ONE: THE ONTARIO EXPERIENCE</u>	9
I Evolution of Child Welfare Services	9
II The Present Context	15
A. Overview	
B. Mandate	
C. Structure	
D. Accountability Relationships	
E. Structure and Relationships in Practice: A Profile	
III Current Critical Issues	25
A. Concerns of the Province	
B. Concerns of Local Governments	
C. Concerns of Other Constituencies	
D. Concerns of the Press	
IV Assessment of Concerns	37
A. Accountability Relationship with the Province	
B. Accountability Relationship with Local Governments	
C. Accountability to the Community and Consumers	
D. Society Boards of Directors	
V A Bridge to the Future	45
A. Accountability Relationship with the Province	
B. Accountability Relationship with Local Governments	
C. Accountability to the Community and Consumers	
D. Society Boards of Directors	

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115465817>

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
<u>PART TWO: OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE</u>	53
I Developing a Framework for Assessment	53
II Provincial Administration	57
A. Description	
B. Example	
C. Evaluation of Potential for Use in Ontario	
D. Effects of Local Children's Services Committees	
E. Political Implications	
III Municipal Administration	65
A. Description	
B. Example	
C. Evaluation of Potential for Use in Ontario	
D. Effects of Local Children's Services Committees	
E. Political Implications	
IV Quasi-Public Administration	71
A. Description	
B. Example	
C. Evaluation of Potential for Use in Ontario	
D. Effects of Local Children's Services Committees	
E. Political Implications	
V Children's Services Committee Administration	81
A. Description	
B. Example	
C. Evaluation of Potential for Use in Ontario	
E. Political Implications	
VI Summary of Options	87
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	93
References	
Bibliography	
Appendices:	
A. Ontario Children's Aid Societies	
B. Societies by Size of Population Served	
C. Survey Results	
D. Children in Care by Province	
E. List of Consultations	
F. Response Form	

STUDY GROUP
ON
CHILD WELFARE SERVICES IN ONTARIO

CHAIRMAN

Bernard M. Dickens
Professor, Faculty of Law
University of Toronto

MEMBERS

Doug Barr
Executive Director
Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto

Dr. Liba Duraj
Professor, Faculty of Social Work
Carleton University

Walter A. Gray
Special Public Affairs Advisor
INCO Limited

Ethel Irwin
Senior Consultant, Public Health Nursing
Ministry of Health

Jacques Martel
Local Director
North Cochrane District Family Services

Inger Parker
Social Worker
Family & Children's Services of London and Middlesex

Jean L. Smith
Alderman
City of Belleville

John Wismer
Supervisor, Family Services Department
Children's Aid Society of the County of Wellington

RESEARCHER/EDITORIAL CONSULTANT

Lorna Grant
Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study group is indebted to a number of individuals and organizations who gave generously of their time to make this study possible.

We wish to thank the member agencies of the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies who provided us with background information on their structure and practices. In particular, we are grateful to the Board and staff members of the six Societies which hosted our visits. They provided a fresh and realistic perspective to our theoretical speculations.

During the course of study and travel, we met with a number of individuals whose cooperation was most helpful. In particular, we thank Dr. Clive Chamberlain and the staff at the Ministry's Children's Services Division, the representatives of the press and other service providers, and the elected and administrative municipal officials who provided us with new information and fresh insights along the way. Special thanks must also go to Mona Nelson, former child welfare consultant for National Health and Welfare, for her assistance in developing a Canada-wide perspective on child welfare systems and concerns.

The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto was our base of operation for nine months. We are indebted to Executive Director Ed Pennington and his staff for their support, advice and cooperation throughout the study. Thanks go to David Priebe, Lorne Simerl and Donna Linton for computing the results for our survey of Societies and to Marvyn Novick for his assistance in developing our research plan. Ruth Chantler receives our collective admiration and gratitude for her administrative support and perseverance through the many drafts and re-drafts of the study.

The study group's particular gratitude is owed to Lorna Grant who worked closely with Doug Barr to plan the direction of the study. When he stepped down as chairman upon accepting the post of Executive Director at the Metro Toronto Children's Aid Society, Lorna became principal custodian of the unifying idea behind our endeavours. She coordinated site visits and our interview schedule, and brought together our data. She also undertook the burden of preparing successive drafts of this report. Our indebtedness to Lorna Grant is therefore immense and profound, since without her skill, energy, and dedication, our task might have overwhelmed us.

This is not a work of today or tomorrow it is for all time. Let us then build wisely the foundations and not hurry too fast over what may seem at the moment insignificant details. Thirty years from now the work of today will be of consequence and our mistakes will loom up big, perhaps to our great sorrow.

J.J. Kelso - 1909

J.J. Kelso was a founder of the child welfare movement in Ontario, the first Provincial Superintendent of Dependent & Neglected Children in Ontario, and a reporter for The Globe.

INTRODUCTION

I THE STUDY

A. Purpose and Background

The Study Group on Child Welfare Services in Ontario was established in June 1978 by the Children's Services Division of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Our task was to produce a study document assessing the present practices and future options which exist regarding the structure and accountability relationships of child welfare services in Ontario.

The study group met regularly over a period of seven months. We hope that the results of our efforts will provide a basis for informed public discussion, followed by specific government policy and action to resolve the issues of concern.

Contents will be of particular interest to the Minister and staff of the Ministry of Community and Social Services, elected and administrative officials of local governments, future members of local children's services committees, and member agencies of the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies.

We have defined child welfare services to include those functions prescribed by The Child Welfare Act for which the Children's Aid Societies have statutory authority. These include protection, prevention and adoption services and services to unmarried parents.

The study focusses specifically on the structure and relationships of child welfare services. Structure refers to the manner in which services are administered, for example under the direction of a particular level of government or a private Board of Directors of a Children's Aid Society. Relationships will be assessed to reveal accountability mechanisms between direct service providers and their government funders, consumers of services and local communities.

B. Content

In 1977, the provincial government committed itself to the goal of providing a full spectrum of services for children with special needs ranging from prevention to intensive intervention. Subsequently most children's services were transferred from other provincial Ministries and integrated under the authority of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. The newly-created Children's Services Division of this Ministry assumed responsibility for most services including corrections, observation and detention homes, day nurseries, children's mental health and child welfare services.

In conjunction with the integration of services at the provincial level, the Ministry is also pursuing a policy of local coordination of services. It is now projected that local governments will eventually assume full authority for the coordinated delivery of children's services through bodies to be known as local children's services committees. The Ministry has begun to implement this policy by approving the formation of four pilot committees to serve as demonstration projects in the regional municipalities of York and Niagara, the joint counties of Prince Edward and Hastings and in the City of Windsor and County of Essex.

The reorganization of the children's services system in Ontario has implications for the structure and relationships of child welfare services. For this reason, it is useful to anticipate how the total system could be structured and the relation of child welfare services to the whole.

The projected system would require the administrators of child welfare services to report directly to the local children's services committee in their area. The committee, in turn, would be accountable to local government for the coordination of services and the allocation of funds within the framework of provincial legislation, standards, policies and guidelines.

A conceptual framework for children's services, based on current provincial policy, can be found on the following page. (1)

C. Need

Of all the services to be included under the mandate of the Children's Services Division and eventually under the jurisdiction of local children's services committees, none is more controversial than that provided by the Children's Aid Societies. Charged with the awesome responsibility of protecting all children in the province under the age of 16 from neglect, abuse and severe emotional disturbance, as well as the responsibility for preventing those circumstances which lead to children requiring protection, the Children's Aid Societies are organizations about which there appear to be few neutral feelings. Their supporters see them as forces of good, protecting neglected infants and bolstering family life so that children may grow up in conditions of freedom and dignity. Their critics view them as either "baby snatchers" intent upon breaking up families or as "bleeding hearts" unable and unwilling to intervene decisively in chaotic family situations which are dangerous to the lives and mental well-being of children.

PROJECTED ORGANIZATION OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES IN ONTARIO

Legislation Standards Guidelines Monitoring	Ministry of Community & Social Services Children's Services Division				
Full authority for coordination and delivery of services	Local Government				
Allocation of funds, needs identification, priority setting, service evaluation coordination	Local Children's Services Committee (CSC)				
Provincial Program Areas	Corrections	Observation/ Detention Homes	Child Welfare	Day Nurseries	Children's Mental Health Services
Statutory Functions					
1. Protection Services 2. Prevention Services 3. Services to Unmarried Parents 4. Adoption Services					
Service Delivery Options*	Provincial Administration	Municipal Administration	CSC	Administration	Quasi-Public Administration

* These options were identified by the study group and will be assessed in Part II of the study.

The controversy has been raging for many years but recently the debate seems to have escalated in volume and intensity. Why? Formerly voluntary organizations funded through private donations, the Societies are now funded almost entirely from public monies. With this public funding have come, particularly at times when the Societies have failed to prevent human tragedies, demands for public accountability and major structural changes. Most major governmental planning studies over the past decade have called for drastic changes in the relationships between the Societies and the public. Yet few changes have occurred.

Through it all, the Societies have continued to deliver child welfare services but they have not been immune to the demoralizing effects of years of unresolved debate about their collective future. A number of Societies admit that they are no longer able to attract or keep a high calibre of professional staff. There is a morale crisis among existing staff who often face inappropriately high caseloads and feel vulnerable to attack at any moment as a possible consequence of their actions. The Boards of Directors of Societies, forced into a defensive stance, spend significant amounts of time justifying their existence and fighting for resources to maintain their present level of service. The Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, established to promote the welfare of children and coordinate the work of Societies, has gained the reputation of promoting only the self-interests of the Societies as private corporations.

The inescapable consequence of the confusion, controversy and uncertainty surrounding Societies is a reduced capacity to deliver services. In other words, children are suffering. This, in itself, is reason enough for assessment and action to resolve the debate once and for all.

Clearly, there is no simple solution. The needs of children and the subsequent demands on Society resources vary in different parts of the province. For example, the Society serving the District of Kenora must provide services for approximately 60,000 people spread over a geographical area equal in size to half of France. The Metro Toronto Society, conversely, serves over one million people in a highly concentrated urban area. To provide appropriate and comprehensive province-wide services under these circumstances is, indeed, a challenge to any system.

With the decision of the Ministry of Community and Social Services to rationalize, reorganize and decentralize service delivery to children in the province, questions regarding the role, functions, relationships and potential of Children's Aid Societies once more come to the fore. In that the Ministry now appears to have not only the will but also the capabilities to make significant changes in this regard, it seems timely that a background study be prepared which would explore and weigh the various options for action facing the Government of Ontario.

D. Limitations

To alleviate any concerns which may arise as the Ministry publishes yet another study involving Societies, it is essential to clearly state what the study does not do.

The study does not make specific recommendations to the Ministry regarding the future of Societies. As a background document, the study attempts to provide an historical perspective, assess the present situation and weigh the pros and cons of various options for the future administration of child welfare services.

The study did not involve an extensive process of consultation with public hearings and written briefs. Its purpose is to stimulate and focus discussion. It is hoped that every constituency affected will be given the opportunity to express its views during a process of public consultation.

The study does not deal with child abuse services or Society budgeting arrangements. These are the responsibility of other Ministry work groups.

The study does not address itself to the possible amalgamation of those services presently offered by the Catholic and Jewish communities with those of the non-sectarian Societies.

E. Methodology

The study group undertook a variety of projects during the course of its research. Specifically, information was gathered by the following means:

- o a review of the historical development of child welfare efforts in Ontario
- o a review of major studies on child welfare services in Ontario
- o a review of other provincial and international models of child welfare administration
- o a written survey of Ontario Children's Aid Societies
- o study visits to six Societies chosen on the basis of size and location

- o consultation with local government officials, media representatives and related service providers in most communities visited
- o consultation with major Ontario-wide constituencies including the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the Association of Counties and Regions of Ontario, the Foster Parents Association of Ontario and the Children's Services Division of the Ministry of Community and Social Services
- o a review and analysis of the editorial positions of leading Ontario newspapers regarding the structure and relationships of Societies.

F. Contents

The study is divided into two parts. Part One traces the historical development of child welfare efforts and describes the present mandate, structure and relationships of Children's Aid Societies. This is followed by a review of current criticisms and concerns regarding Societies and an assessment of the validity, representativeness and scope of these concerns. Finally, a number of mechanisms for strengthening Society structure and relationships are suggested.

Part Two of the study focuses on future options for the administration of child welfare services. Four models are assessed on the basis of their potential viability in Ontario. Also included is a description of the possible relationships between each model and the projected local children's services committees. The political implications of each of the four options are also analysed. Finally, the major strengths and weaknesses of each model are presented in summary form.

II THE PHILOSOPHY

Human life, unfortunately, has no guarantees. It does, however, have many risks. Those charged with the responsibility of protecting children, the most vulnerable members of our society, cannot hope to eliminate these risks. They can, however, be expected to do their utmost to minimize them. This, we believe, is a realistic goal to demand of any child welfare system.

The success of any effort begins with realistic expectations. The child welfare system cannot assume responsibility for all the ills inflicted on children in society and yet it is often expected to do so. Unfortunately, the realities of child welfare mean that no system, present or future, can ever guarantee that children will not die. This fact was one which we had reluctantly to accept before proceeding to develop criteria for evaluating the present child welfare system and options for the future.

Basic beliefs and value systems have a large influence on the design, direction and methodology of any service delivery system. Recognizing this, the study group devoted considerable time to developing a statement of philosophy which it believes forms the basis for progressive child welfare efforts. (2) The analysis contained in the study is based on agreement that any present or future child welfare system in Ontario should reflect the following philosophy in practice:

- o a belief that the welfare and development of children are collective responsibilities and that community intervention and assistance should therefore be viewed as both natural and helpful
- o a belief in the worth of children as persons with rights, capacities and increasing potential to make their individual contributions to society
- o a belief in the importance of family life and family relationships to an individual's development
- o a belief that, whenever possible, children should remain within their own homes and that society bears some responsibility for the emotional and economic well-being of individual family units
- o a belief that services should recognize and account for the increasing variety of legitimate forms of family life which are evolving as a result of changing social and economic conditions

- o a belief that "help" is most effective when based on cooperation and shared perceptions and that recognition should be given to the need for consumers to be involved, where appropriate, in the design, delivery and evaluation of services
- o a belief that expenditures on all basic child welfare services, including both prevention and protection services to children in their own homes, are a proper charge on the public purse and that service structures must be held accountable to funders, consumers and the community served.

PART ONE - THE ONTARIO EXPERIENCE

I EVOLUTION OF CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Any credible assessment of present practices and future options regarding child welfare services should be based upon an appreciation of the evolution of the structure and relationships in Ontario and the roles played by the provincial government, local governments and the Children's Aid Societies. The following synopsis will attempt to identify the major social and political developments which shaped child welfare structures and relationships over the last century.

Comments on the development of Societies are based largely upon the experiences in Toronto because of a lack of detailed documented information on other Societies. It is likely, however, that the Societies shared many similarities in their evolution.

From the passage of The Orphan's Act in 1799 to the enactment of The Apprentices and Minors Act in 1851, apprenticeship was the only provision made for orphaned or deserted children. Reflecting the prevailing emphasis on the work ethic and a laissez-faire philosophy, only children bound into apprenticeship were offered any form of legal recognition and then only in exchange for their labour.

During that time, no provisions existed for non-apprenticed children despite The Municipal Act of 1849 which created local governments and permitted relief-giving by local authorities. Few efforts were made to care for non-apprenticed children because, while provincial funds provided for adult offenders and the institutionalized mentally-ill, measures for children depended solely upon local initiative and financing. (3)

In 1874, charitable societies were given the legal authority to intervene to prevent the maltreatment of apprentices. Adoption and institutional care then began to emerge as alternatives to apprenticeship for children.

In 1884, an amendment to The Industrial Schools Act of 1874 allowed local school trustees to delegate responsibility for the establishment of residential training schools for children under age 14 to any incorporated philanthropic society, subject to Provincial approval of the society's by-laws. This development marked the emergence of shared public/private responsibility which was to become a feature of the Children's Aid Societies of the future.

Courts were allowed to make children wards of institutions and charitable organizations through the provisions of The Children's Protection Act of 1888. Public responsibility for the care of children was established by the requirement that local governments assume the maintenance costs of wards. This legislation facilitated the use of foster homes as alternatives to institutions and, because of the increasingly popular belief that environment determined a child's future, charitable institutions did not hesitate to seek removal of children from unsatisfactory homes. (4)

The late 1800's marked a turning point in the development of child welfare efforts with the founding of the Toronto Children's Aid Society in 1891 by a group of citizens headed by J.J. Kelso. It was largely through the efforts of these individuals that The Children's Protection Act of 1893 was passed.

Although The Children's Protection Act contained no provisions regarding Society organization, membership or management, Societies were given wide powers including the right to remove children from their homes, responsibility for the "supervision and management" of children in municipal shelters, and the status and prerogatives of legal guardians. In addition, Societies were empowered to collect a "reasonable sum" from their municipalities for maintenance of wards. With this legislation Children's Aid Societies became semi-public agencies with a legal mandate and private Boards of Directors.

The Toronto Society received its first municipal grant of \$2,000 in 1894. This sum was negotiated in lieu of per ward maintenance payments at the request of the Society which feared greater government involvement. (5) Later, in 1906, the Society refused a Provincial offer of a daily rate for children in its care. The Society's Board declined, fearing that government funding would deter private donations. (6) No provincial monies were accepted by the Toronto Society until 1925.

In 1900, a Toronto by-law established that a City representative sit on the Society Board. The by-law was passed annually until provincial legislation in 1954 provided for a minimum of one municipal representative on all Society Boards.

During this period, more than sixty Societies were founded in other parts of Ontario and Societies were also operating in Winnipeg, Vancouver and Victoria. In 1912, the Associated Children's Aid Societies of Ontario, which later became the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies (OACAS), was founded. The Association requested and received the courtesy of viewing all child welfare legislation before its introduction to the legislature.

Until approximately 1920, the Toronto Society's Board of Directors functioned as an autonomous body, responsible only to itself and heavily involved in fund-raising and direct service provision. However, in 1916, public criticism regarding the quality of care children were receiving from the Society led the provincial government to ask the Mayor of Toronto to reorganize the Society. A provincial Grand Jury investigation later absolved the Society, praised its work and recommended increased public assistance. (7)

Around this time, the role of the Toronto Board began to change as a result of several developments. In 1919, a group of citizens, still concerned about the quality of care offered by the Society, decided to organize to vote out the Board of Directors. In the following years, increasing numbers of individuals with training and expertise related to children joined the Board. This development led to the appointment of R.E. Mills in 1923 as the first paid professional Director of the Toronto Society. (8)

As Mills began to reorganize the Society, develop professional staff and improve the financial situation, there was a notable shift in power from the Board to the Director. The Board reluctantly agreed to join the Federation for Community Services, the forerunner to United Way, to alleviate the Society's financial problems. The Federation then assumed the cost of non-ward care while the Society renegotiated with the City and began to receive daily payments for each child committed by the Court to Society care. Lump sum grants which had failed to increase sufficiently over the years to cover costs were discontinued.

In 1925, the provincial government instituted a grants system with amounts determined by each Society's graded efficiency and the degree of responsibility it assumed in the community. The Toronto Society despite its earlier reluctance to submit to further government interference, used this money to expand its foster care program in response to increasing public pressure to reduce the use of institutions for children. (9)

The tensions which characterized the relationship between the Toronto Society and the City of Toronto in the early years of the Society's history were apparently not unique to Toronto. In 1937, the Peterborough Municipal Council asked the provincial government to enact legislation enabling the Council to appoint the Society Board. The Toronto Society wrote to the Province expressing its concern that such a move would cause each Society to become simply another administrative department of the government. (10)

The Child Welfare Act of 1954 and its subsequent Regulations and Amendments marked the provincial government's acceptance of direct responsibility for Children's Aid Societies. The Act, while reaffirming the principle of delegation to private agencies, established accountability mechanisms for Societies which included monthly submission of statistical reports to the Province. It also made provisions for Officers of Societies, minimum municipal representation on Society Boards, and described minimum qualifications for local directors of Societies.

During this period, a new provincial grants system replaced the merit system and allocated funds on the basis of the proportion of Society workers working with children in their own homes. In addition, the Province increased its reimbursements to municipalities for ward maintenance from 25 percent to 40 percent. Provincial responsibility was thus increased for children in Society care and, for the first time, established for children in their own homes. This marked the beginning of government recognition of the importance of the prevention of circumstances leading to the necessity of removing children from their homes.

The provincial Director of Child Welfare assumed responsibility for the enforcement of The Child Welfare Act and, in 1957, was given authority to "advise, inspect and supervise" Societies. Thus, over the course of nearly seventy years, the Societies evolved from totally private agencies with legal authority to quasi-public agencies with private Boards but increasing public financing and required accountability through reporting and Provincial supervision. By 1960, the percentage of private dollars in Society budgets had dropped to a low of 10 percent with municipal and provincial contributions accounting for 53 percent and 37 percent respectively. (11)

In 1965, a new Child Welfare Act was enacted and remains in effect today. The Act increased mandatory municipal representation on Society Boards from one to four councillors. Most significantly, it provided for mandatory financing of Societies for increased statutory services including preventive services. The new financing scheme required the Province to pay 60 percent and the municipality to pay 40 percent of each Society's approved operating costs. In 1970, the scheme changed to 80 percent provincial and 20 percent municipal contributions.

In 1977, a process was initiated by the provincial government which could have broad implications for the future delivery of child welfare services. Most children's services have now been integrated under the authority of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. It is projected that responsibility for children's services, including child welfare, will ultimately be vested in local governments which, through local children's services committees, would become accountable for the provision of services within the framework of provincial legislation, standards and guidelines. (12)

In reviewing the historical development of child welfare structure and relationships in Ontario, several general observations ought to be made.

Over the years there have been gradual but definite shifts in government responsibility for child welfare services although Societies have retained responsibility for direct delivery of services. Until the 1930's, local governments were required to assume the full costs of maintaining Society wards. The Depression created a heightened demand for Society services which strained limited local resources. The provincial government gradually assumed a greater role in financing and directing child welfare services. By 1965, the Province had become the primary funder of Societies. In 1978, the provincial government appeared to commit itself to a shift of responsibility back to the local level through the creation of local children's services committees responsible to local government. Although the provincial and municipal cost-sharing arrangements for child welfare are not projected to change, the services and relationships of Societies will undoubtedly be affected. The full significance of the projected changes has yet to be determined.

The historical review also suggests that whichever body funds child welfare services holds the ultimate power and largely determines the direction and focus of services. Thus, in Toronto, the Society operated as a private body, raised its own funds and was accountable only to itself until the 1920's. At that time financial difficulties and growing public concern forced the Board of the Society to accept increased public funding and to open its doors to Board members from diverse backgrounds. Gradually, the visibility of the Board decreased as it relinquished its fund-raising role to government and its service-providing role to professional staff.

Although Societies have maintained their private Boards of Directors throughout the years, the nature of Boards has been significantly affected by changes in legislation, government intervention and financing, public expectations and by the professionalization of social work. What began as a movement of private citizens armed with contribution boxes and good intentions has become a multi-million dollar network of private corporations funded by public money and administered by several thousand professional staff members. Ontario is the only province in Canada with Societies serving every part of the province. In fact, the quasi-public system in Ontario appears to be unique in the world.

Having weathered the shifts in government involvement and priorities, the Children's Aid Societies remain the target of public speculation and scrutiny. Some observers say that the role and functions of Society Boards of Directors, the last vestiges of their private origins, have been eroded and that they are no longer viable bodies in which the authority for the welfare of children should be vested. Others claim that the Society structure is sound and that to alter or abolish it would be to dismiss the traditions and expertise developed throughout a century of efforts.

The balance of the study examines present Society structure and relationships and assesses possible options for the future. The appropriate role for public and private interests in child welfare will remain a central issue for attention.

II THE PRESENT CONTEXT

A. Overview

Child welfare services in Ontario are delivered by 51 Children's Aid Societies which serve every part of the province. Nine Societies serve populations under 60,000. Seventeen serve populations between 60,000 and 150,000 and fourteen have jurisdiction in communities of over 150,000 people. Eleven Societies service northern Ontario, three Societies serve Catholic communities and one agency serves the Jewish community in Metro Toronto. (13)

As noted in the Introduction, conditions vary greatly around the province creating differing types of need for child welfare services. In many parts of northern Ontario, for example, Society staff must travel hundreds of miles by car or bush plane to reach remote communities with predominantly native populations. In other parts of the province, particularly Metro Toronto, Societies must respond to a variety of different needs and expectations in communities with diverse social, economic, cultural and ethnic constituencies. Thus, while Societies share a common purpose and legal mandate, their character and style differ from one area to another. As a result, it is difficult to describe a "typical" Society in detail.

The estimated budget for all Society services in 1978 was \$107,826,450. The provincial government is required by law to pay 80 percent of each Society's approved net expenditures and the local municipality must assume 20 percent of the costs. In areas without a municipal organization within the jurisdiction of a Society, the Province is required to assume 100 percent of the expenditures for statutory child welfare services. The federal government pays 100 percent of the costs of native children in care and also contributes a significant amount to the provincial government's contribution through a cost-sharing agreement under the Canada Assistance Plan.

B. Mandate

Each Society operates under the authority of The Child Welfare Act of Ontario. Under the terms of the Act, Societies must be registered as corporations and approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. As a corporation, each Society is required to develop a constitution and by-laws. The by-laws and any subsequent amendments must be approved by the Minister of Community and Social Services and filed with a provincial Director of Child Welfare. (Note: as of April 1979, four regional Directors of Child Welfare will assume responsibility previously held by one centrally-located Director.)

Section 6(2) of The Child Welfare Act outlines the legal mandate of Societies for which they receive mandatory funding from the Province and local governments. The Act states:

6(2) Every children's aid society shall be operated for the purposes of,

- (a) investigating allegations or evidence that children may be in need of protection;
- (b) protecting children where necessary;
- (c) providing guidance, counselling and other services to families for protecting children or for the prevention of circumstances requiring the protection of children;
- (d) providing care for children assigned or committed to its care under this or any other Act;
- (e) supervising children assigned to its supervision under this or any other Act;
- (f) placing of children for adoption;
- (g) assisting the parents of children born or likely to be born outside of marriage and their children born outside of marriage; and
- (h) any other duties given to it by this or any other Act.

The Act does not prevent Societies from providing additional services on a voluntary basis. However, if a Society is unable to fulfill the basic statutory functions outlined in the Act, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint a new Board of Directors or may, on the recommendation of the Minister, dissolve a Society. In a case of Society dissolution, the Ministry would become responsible for providing services to that area. These provisions have not to date been invoked by the Province.

C. Structure

The Child Welfare Act is administered through the Ministry of Community and Social Services by thirteen Directors of Child Welfare. The Directors are required to advise, supervise and inspect Children's Aid Societies and submit annual reports to the Minister. Although Societies report to the Directors, the Minister remains ultimately responsible and politically accountable for the enforcement of the Act and the operation of Societies.

The Act requires that every Society be governed by a Board of Directors, elected by Society members in a general meeting under the terms of the by-laws. The Board must include no fewer than four municipal councillors who must also serve on a nine-member executive committee.

The Board of each Society is also required to appoint a local director, subject to Ministerial approval, to administer and enforce The Child Welfare Act. The local director must cooperate with the Director of Child Welfare and be responsible to the Board for the daily operation of the Society including the hiring of staff and the implementation of policies and programs approved by the Board. Minimum qualifications of local directors and staff are also prescribed by the Act.

All Societies are corporate members of the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies (OACAS) which exists "to advance the ability of the Societies to render service and to act as a liaison with governments". (15) Its Board is elected on a regional basis from Society staff and members. OACAS organizes an annual conference and aims to facilitate and enhance the work of Societies through collective action, public relations, dissemination of information, stimulation of uniformity of standards and assistance to individual Societies.

D. Accountability Relationships

Accountability expectations exist on two levels for Societies due to their status as publicly funded agencies with a legal mandate. First, they must account for their use of public money and, second, they must answer for their performance in the fulfillment of their statutory duties. Societies are bound to a number of relationships as a result of these expectations.

While Societies may engage in voluntary activities to enhance their accountability, certain legal requirements create statutory relationships between Societies, the Province and municipalities.

Societies are, for example, required to accept four municipal councillors on the Executive Committees of their Boards. No reporting is required although, presumably, the intention is that councillors on the Society Board will ensure the appropriate use of municipal funds and facilitate accountability to the broad local community.

Accountability to the Province is more complex. With the power to dissolve Societies which do not fulfill their duties, the Government, through the Minister of Community and Social Services, remains ultimately accountable to the public for the provision of child welfare services. The Minister, in turn, delegates his authority to the Directors of Child Welfare who are responsible for ensuring that Societies operate within approved budgets and prescribed standards of services. Standards are presently being reviewed and expanded by the Ministry and will eventually cover every area of children's service, including child welfare.

Accountability is enforced through the powers of the Directors of Child Welfare to:

advise and supervise societies...inspect or direct and supervise the inspection of the operation and records of societies...inspect or direct and supervise the inspection of any place in which a child in the care of a society is placed... (16)

In addition, Societies are required to report to the Directors of Child Welfare through monthly statistical and financial statements and must file an annual audited financial statement for the previous year. They are also bound to provide any other information requested by the Directors.

Beyond statutory relationships with government funders, Societies are also accountable to their consumers and local communities for the provision of suitable services. This expectation is based on the fact that Societies are funded by public monies from taxpayers and the knowledge that services of "helping" agencies are most effective when based on shared perceptions of problems. No legal mechanisms exist to enforce these types of accountability which, as a result, vary from one Society to another.

E. Structure and Relationships in Practice: A Profile

In July 1978, the study group requested and received the cooperation of Societies in completing a survey designed to augment information gathered through the annual OACAS survey. Questions focussed on policy and practices regarding Boards of Directors, Society membership and volunteer programs, and fund-raising activities.

Forty-three Societies responded to the survey. For the purposes of analysis, Societies were broken down according to the size of the population served. Responses were received from nine small Societies, eleven medium, twelve large and eleven northern. (See Appendix B for divisions.)

The main findings of the survey are highlighted on the following pages. (See Appendix C for complete results.)

1. Boards of Directors

The 43 Societies surveyed reported a total of 869 individuals, including municipal councillors, serving on Boards of Directors. Sizes of Boards range from 11 to 37 members with the median size being 19.8.

Almost 60 percent of the Board members have served less than three years with the figure rising to 71.2 percent in small Societies. Only 12.4 percent have served more than six years.

Although the occupations of 20.8 percent of the Board members were not reported, the majority of those reported were managers or administrators (25.6 percent of those identified), homemakers (18.3 percent), teachers (12.1 percent), social workers (10 percent), retired (6 percent); or in agriculture (5.5 percent), medicine or health (5.7 percent), the clergy (5.3 percent) or sales (5.1 percent).

Societies were asked to identify the racial and ethnic origins of their Board members in an attempt to determine representativeness of the communities served. Eight Societies refused to answer and others had difficulty which resulted in the identification of only 507 members. Of those identified, 398 or almost 80 percent are anglo-saxon Canadian, American or British. Forty-five members are francophone and eleven are native people. Nine of the eleven native people serve on Boards in northern Societies and account for 4.2 percent of the northern Board membership. Francophones represent approximately 10 percent of the Board membership in both small and northern Societies.

Municipal councillors account for 20.9 percent of the total Board membership. Foster and adoptive parents are 8.1 percent and 12.9 percent respectively. Eight present consumers and twenty-four former consumers serve on Boards, accounting for 3.7 percent of the membership. Eleven staff members also serve. Only four Societies have by-laws requiring special representation of any group, usually on a geographic or regional basis.

Thus, based on information received, a "typical" Board of Directors will have twenty members over half of whom will have served less than three years. Five members will be managers or administrators, three will be homemakers, two will be teachers and one or two will be from the social service field. Twelve to sixteen members will be of anglo-saxon origin. Four members will be municipal representatives, two or three will be adoptive parents, and one or two will be foster parents. Staff or clients will not usually be represented. In the north, the native and francophone populations will usually have some representation on Boards.

In addition to Board composition, survey results also revealed Board practices and policies.

The most popular method of Board member recruitment is the individual approach. Approximately twenty-five Societies also send a letter to members and place a community announcement and eight Societies telephone their memberships.

Board members are nominated by a nominating committee in all Societies. Thirty-five Societies also accept written nominations and thirty accept nominations from the floor at the Annual Meeting. Seven Societies have had no elections acclaimed since 1968, while seventeen or 39.5 percent have acclaimed every election in the past 10 years.

The Board structure includes standing committees on which Board members and sometimes volunteers and staff to sit to work on specific aspects of each Society's work. Board priorities are indicated in the results of a survey question to learn which committees are presently active. Services committees are active in 93 percent of Societies, Personnel in 90.7 percent, Finance in 86.1 percent, Nominating in 74.4 percent, Public Relations in 72.1 percent, and Property in 69.8 percent. Membership and Social Issues committees are active in only 32.6 percent and 18.6 percent of the Societies respectively.

In the event of staff complaints or grievances, twelve Boards have a complaint committee or other established mechanism. Eleven Boards have some mechanism for hearing consumer complaints and in six Societies volunteers may file a complaint. Thirty Societies or 69.8 percent report no mechanisms for complaints to the Board. Between June 1977 and June 1978, eight clients and six staff registered complaints with Society Boards. No volunteer complaints were reported.

Half the Societies surveyed have open Board meetings while eight are open to Board members only. Seven Societies allow their members to attend Board meetings while four Societies have no policy regarding attendance.

The 1977 OACAS survey reported that the media were invited to Board meetings in 35 percent of the Societies and that 16 percent sent copies of Board minutes to the media. The study group survey indicated that the media regularly attended Board meetings of only nine Societies but that approximately half the Boards had the media present at special meetings. Most Societies reported good media relations while 30.2 percent classified them as excellent and 4.7 percent stated they were fair.

2. Membership

Membership, excluding the Board, in surveyed Societies ranges from 3 to 1,500. A total of 7,445 Society members was reported. Of this number, 306 are staff members. The median size of Society membership is 76.5. Fifty-seven percent of the members belong to large Societies, 19.8 percent to medium, 10.2 percent to small, and 13 percent to northern.

When asked their reasons for having a membership, 74.4 percent of the Societies reported that members are sought to help in Society work or as a method of public relations. Two Societies stated that they have a membership because it is required by law and nine Societies either stated that they did not know the reason for membership or chose not to answer.

Twelve Societies require Board approval of membership applications, although only two Boards have even rejected an application. Twenty-five Societies have by-laws prohibiting membership of minors and non-residents while ten prohibit staff.

As previously reported, only fourteen Societies have active membership committees. Twelve Societies indicated that they conduct orientation sessions for new members. Twenty-eight Societies hold special events for members while twenty-two send a newsletter and four send copies of Board minutes.

3. Volunteers

Children's Aid Societies were founded through voluntary initiative to protect the welfare of children. Although 11 Societies now offer Board members honoraria ranging from \$2 to \$48 per meeting (17), most Boards remain voluntary in nature.

The study group survey sought to discover the extent of voluntary involvement in Societies beyond the Board level as an indicator of their ability to maintain their voluntary traditions. Non-Board volunteers in Societies are usually involved as drivers, tutors, baby-sitters, case aides, group leaders, clerical assistants or friendly visitors.

The number of volunteers in Societies ranges from 0 to 640, excluding Board members. The median number of volunteers in each Society is 20.2 and the total number reported across the province is 2,559. Of this total, 78.7 percent of the volunteers are with large Societies, 10.5 percent are with medium, 6.9 percent are with small and 4 percent are with northern. One medium and two northern Societies report no volunteers while thirteen Societies report less than 10.

Although no breakdown on years of service was given for 36.6 percent of the volunteers, 40.7 percent of the reported number have served less than three years while 20.7 percent have served between three and ten years and 2 percent have served for more than ten years.

Twenty Societies, including all large Societies, have a volunteer co-ordinator in some capacity. None of the northern Societies has a co-ordinator. Ten Societies have a full-time staff co-ordinator and the rest use either part-time staff or volunteers.

Twenty-four or 55.8 percent of the Societies report active recruitment of volunteers in the past year. Twenty-eight Societies hold orientation sessions for volunteers.

4. Fund Raising Practices

The study group was interested in learning the number of Societies which solicited funds from public and private sources in addition to their statutory public funding. The survey was designed to discover the extent and success of these efforts since 1968 based on the assumption that fund-raising is a traditional activity of voluntary Boards of Directors.

Since 1968, there has been a steady increase in the number of Societies receiving additional government grants from one in 1968 to sixteen in 1977. Between 1968 and 1973, all but two of the eleven Societies receiving grants were large Societies.

While the number of government grants has increased over the past 10 years, grants from private sources have remained relatively constant. Seven Societies received private grants in 1968 and eleven in 1977. Large Societies received private grants 52 times between 1968 and 1977 while northern Societies received only three.

III CURRENT CRITICAL ISSUES

As the organizations with delegated authority and responsibility for the welfare of children in Ontario, the Societies have seemed the logical targets for criticism whenever a human tragedy is brought to public attention.

The purpose of this section is to examine the nature and extent of the criticisms levelled at Societies regarding their structure and relationships. Who has expressed concerns? How representative are the criticisms? What solutions have been suggested? How have the Societies responded? What changes have resulted?

A. Concerns of the Province

Five major studies which commented on the structure and relationships of Children's Aid Societies were commissioned by the provincial government in the past ten years. Three examined the province-wide system and two included child welfare services in commission reviews of Ottawa-Carleton and Metropolitan Toronto respectively.

1. A Study of the Managerial Effectiveness of Children's Aid Societies in Ontario, (Urwick, Currie and Partners Ltd.), June 1969

The purpose of this study was to review the practices and financial policies of the Societies to enable the Minister to better appraise their effectiveness and anticipate the financial impact of their programs on the Province.

The study expressed general concerns at the absence of criteria for evaluating change and the deterrents to innovation caused by social work traditions, e.g., excessive casework recording. Also noted was a reduced incentive to improve economic efficiency following the increase in mandatory government funding to Societies.

Regarding Society structure, the study found the role of the Board of Directors unclear. Boards were found to be too large and generally unskilled in evaluating social work programs. Dangers of director-selected Boards were highlighted as deterrents to objectivity. The role of municipal representatives was found to be unsatisfactory in cost-benefit terms and the lack of provision for Provincial representation was perceived as a weakness. Finally, the study noted a lack of coordination resulting in duplication of effort regarding common problems of the 51 Boards of Societies.

The study recommended that the Province define the authority of Boards thus allowing each Board to set objectives within a provincial context.

Also suggested was the possible consolidation of small Societies and Roman Catholic Societies and a reduction in size of very large Boards.

Regarding Societies' relationship to the Province, the study noted problems in communication as Societies try to preserve autonomy and the Province strives for greater accountability. The creation of an advisory board of seven Society local directors and one Department representative was recommended to improve communication between Societies and the Province. Provincial takeover of services was considered advisable only as a last resort and felt to be politically and financially unwise.

The study also noted a lack of uniform standards by which performance could be measured against objectives. This lack was found to cause difficulties in the initiation of corrective action.

OACAS supported much of the report including the principle of an advisory structure although it expressed concern at the lack of proposed participation of Board members. Accordingly, it urged the use of OACAS as the Advisory Board. (18)

A modified advisory structure was subsequently introduced by the Province. At present, one Society director from each OACAS region meets with Provincial representatives at Queen's Park six times a year. No action resulted from other recommendations although similar concerns are still expressed by some Ministry personnel.

2. Report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Adoption and Foster Care (The Mullins Report), June 1970

Although the Committee's official mandate was limited to policy matters affecting adoption and foster care, members found it necessary to comment on the structure of Societies in the context of regional government.

The Committee noted a lack of cooperation, communication and unity of approach among the separate Societies. In addition, the provincial Child Welfare Department was not felt to be providing the necessary leadership for efficient local operation of Societies, resulting in service disparity throughout Ontario.

Complete centralization, however, was rejected as a solution by the Committee which believed that such a structure could lead to impersonal administration and lack of community interest and assistance. Alternatively, it recommended that services be administered through regional children's services boards responsible to those regional governments which were felt to have adequate size, resources and communities of interest.

Finally the Committee recommended the establishment of an Advisory Committee to the Minister composed of the chairpersons of each Regional Board and others appointed by the Minister.

No action was taken on these recommendations although the philosophy of local responsibility for services is reflected in the current reorganization of children's services and the concept of local children's services committees.

3. Task Force Report on Selected Issues and Relationships (The Hanson Report), January 1974

This report was one of several produced by the Task Force which was asked to look into all matters pertaining to the management of the Ministry of Community and Social Services and to make recommendations which would enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the Ministry.

The Task Force contended that the child welfare system was structurally geared to the care and maintenance of children in care and was not responding to the fact that prevention should be the prime orientation of the system. The desire to increase the support of the family unit to prevent removal of children was felt to have resulted in a philosophical deviation from traditional services and subsequent tension between Societies and the Child Welfare Branch of the Ministry. While noting the difficulty of generalizing criticisms due to the wide variety of Societies, the Task Force expressed concern that this same variation created very different levels of effectiveness and that no standards existed against which to measure effectiveness.

Regarding Society structure, the Task Force found that many Boards were unrepresentative of their communities, had little appreciation of Society consumers, were self-perpetuating and no longer relevant in terms of fund-raising. Most importantly, the Boards were responsible for administering public funds but were not directly accountable to the public.

The Task Force made specific recommendations to improve the present system. The first of these involved expanding the mandate and combining Societies with Family Service Agencies. Secondly, the Ministry was urged to give priority to establishing standards, and measurement and information systems.

Society accountability could be enhanced, it was suggested, by devising a mechanism for consumer complaints and improving the structure of Boards. Specifically, the Ministry was urged to put Societies on warning to increase their memberships and drop any restrictions. The Task Force also recommended that Board election and nomination procedures be opened to reduce the possibility of self-perpetuation. In addition, it was suggested that municipalities be permitted to appoint at least half the members of the Board without restriction as to qualification.

The Task Force believed that the relationship between Societies and the Ministry could be improved if Ministry consultants were decentralized to area offices to which Societies would report directly.

If the Ministry's conclusion was to abolish Societies, the Task Force believed that no single model could appropriately serve all parts of Ontario and favoured a shared division between the Province and local governments depending upon local needs. Concern was expressed, however, that local or provincial government administration would not guarantee improvement and that, before drastic change, every effort should be made to improve the existing system.

OACAS, while agreeing with many of the Task Force recommendations, urged that the report not be publicly released due to the allegedly distorted picture it presented of child welfare services. (19) It called for joint Ministry and OACAS development of standards and asked for Ministry support for development of an accreditation facility comparable to that of the Child Welfare League of America. Finally, the Minister was asked to introduce legislation to stabilize the existing financing formula.

Action was eventually taken on two Task Force recommendations. The Ministry is presently involved in an intensive program of standards development and, secondly, is decentralizing its staff to regional offices.

4. Report of the Ottawa-Carleton Review Commission (The Mayo Report),
October 1976

The Commission considered, among many other items, whether the Ottawa Society should remain virtually independent or be brought under the jurisdiction of the regional Social Services Department. It concluded that the Society should be abolished and its functions administered by a new Child Welfare Branch of the Social Services Department.

Reasons for the recommendation included the perceived ability of the municipal department to deliver child welfare services and effect closer coordination of all social services. The Commission also pointed to the demonstrated capacity of the municipality to involve the public and volunteers through, for example, citizens' advisory committees. Finally, the Commission reasoned that where a local service is primarily publicly funded, it should be subject to control by elected government.

No action has yet been taken on this recommendation although the creation of local children's services committees may facilitate action to transfer the child welfare mandate to municipal departments.

5. Report of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto (The Roberts Report), June 1977

The Commission considered, among other things, the delivery of child welfare services in Metro Toronto. Concern was expressed that children's services were fragmented and that Societies were not adequately accountable to any level of government for the spending of tax dollars. The Commission noted the relation between low income and child protection problems and the need for a closer relationship with the Metro Social Services Department.

The Commission concluded that abolition of Societies could mean loss of extensive volunteer support and the degrees of flexibility and expertise needed to respond to child protection cases. Therefore, it recommended that Metro Council be designated as the local children's services committee and that the responsibility for child welfare services, including the power to create, alter or abolish Societies, be vested in the Municipality of Metro Toronto. In this way, local authorities could, in theory, discharge child welfare responsibilities in the manner most appropriate to needs.

No specific action has been taken on these recommendations. The Ministry has not yet approved a local children's services committee for Metro Toronto, nor has it determined the extent of the powers over Societies to be delegated to these committees.

B. Concerns of Local Governments

In 1964, the Ontario Municipal Association and the Ontario Welfare Officers' Association proposed to the Minister's Advisory Committee on Child Welfare that child welfare services be administered by local municipal departments with provincial regulation and control. (20)

Later, in 1975, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) adopted a resolution calling on the Province to assume all responsibilities relating to wardship and adoption of children and to delegate other child welfare functions to municipal social service departments. (21)

Motivation for these recommendations stemmed from a conviction among many municipal administrators and politicians that Societies are not adequately accountable for their use of public monies. (22) Inadequate reporting, lack of coordination with other social services and out-dated structural dependence on volunteers have also been cited as indicators of the need for municipal takeover.

In the event that the present system is retained, municipal officials have called on the Province to vest final budget approval for child welfare services in municipal councils. (23) Accountability could be further enhanced, some claim, by also allowing local councils to appoint Society Boards of Directors.

During consultations with municipal officials on local field visits, the study group heard confirmation of these concerns regarding Societies. While most officials hesitated to advocate actual abolition of Societies and municipal takeover of their functions, lack of accountability and the isolation of Societies from the community and other services were frequent criticisms. Several expressed hope that the establishment of local children's services committees would do much to improve the situation through the vesting of responsibility in local government and the creation of a mechanism for local accountability for Societies.

OACAS has gone on record numerous times in opposition to the official municipal position. To separate responsibility for the child in care (wardship and adoption) from the responsibility for children in their own homes, it claims, would be a regressive step and cause damage to the efforts of Societies to integrate services to children in their own homes with those to children in care and the family in the community. (24)

OACAS has also rejected claims that Societies are not accountable to local governments pointing out that every Society, by law, has four elected municipal officials on the Executive Committee of its Board. This representation, claims OACAS, is sufficient to ensure adequate joint discussion of programs and budgets. (25)

C. Concerns of Other Constituencies

Throughout the course of study, the study group sought to solicit the opinions of related constituencies such as other service providers, community groups and Society consumers, regarding Society structure and relationships. Each field visit involved consultation with as many of these groups as possible.

While lack of accountability was frequently raised as a concern, few suggestions were made regarding possible solutions. None of the groups consulted were willing to take a strong position advocating abolition of Societies and transfer of their functions. The majority of concerns expressed by related constituencies were based on service issues or personalities of particular individuals within Societies.

Consultation with Society consumers proved extremely difficult due to their traditional low visibility and the lack of priority attached to their involvement by most Societies. A staff member of one group whose members are largely present or former Society consumers suggested that the subject of study, i.e. Society structure and relationships, was a "non-issue". The question of which body administers the services, she felt, is largely irrelevant to consumers who are primarily concerned with their relationship with their worker and the actual service provided.

D. Concerns of the Press

Assuming that the media both reflects and shapes public opinion, the study group conducted a review of the editorial positions of eight Ontario newspapers between 1968 and 1978. The purpose of this review was to discover the extent to which public concerns regarding Societies had been reflected in or initiated by newspapers across the Province. Were editorials critical, supportive or neutral? What solutions to problems were suggested? What significance could be attached to the editorials?

The review was limited by the fact that only seven Ontario newspapers maintain cross-indexed files and that no other source has any cross-indexed clippings before 1977. Accordingly, the review considered a limited but fairly representative sampling of editorial opinion, all emanating from newspapers with Societies in their jurisdictions.

In addition to the review of printed editorials, the study group sought to consult with local newspaper representatives during field visits to Societies. The purpose of these consultations was to explore the press/Society relationship and to learn what newspaper representatives saw as the impetus behind editorials concerning Societies.

1. The Globe and Mail

A major aspect of the review was the study and analysis of the editorial position of the Toronto Globe and Mail. This newspaper has over the years become identified with a consistently strong position regarding Societies. Between 1968 and November 1978, nineteen editorials directly related to Societies appeared in the Globe. (26) Ten of the nineteen appeared in 1978. No editorials were published between September 1973 and December 1977. Until 1978, all editorials appeared between August and December.

All Globe editorials are critical of the provincial government and/or Societies and cite lack of both accountability and standardized services as the main problems. The solution offered either directly or indirectly in 15 of the 19 editorials is abolition of Societies and transfer of child welfare services to Provincial authorities.

Between 1968 and 1973, calls for takeover of Societies by the Province were very strong. Criticism was aimed most directly at the Province for abdicating its responsibility to provide sufficient support and resources to Societies to do their jobs. After a gap of four years, the takeover theme was revived primarily through indirect implication or tentative suggestion. Criticism became directed less at government and more at Societies for their alleged lack of competence and accountability.

The high number of editorials since December 1977 may be related to increased activity in the field of children's services following the reorganization of services and the projected creation of local children's services committees. The Globe appears skeptical of the planned transfer of authority to local governments and suggests that it may be a further attempt by the Province to avoid direct accountability and deflect blame to a lower level.

2. The Toronto Star

Like the Globe, the Toronto Star has commented frequently on Societies in its editorial pages. Fifteen editorials have been published since 1968, including four in 1978. (27)

Unlike the Globe, however, the Star remains generally supportive of Societies, choosing instead to direct its editorials primarily at the Province for its inadequate funding of Societies, particularly in the area of prevention services.

Commenting on the structure and mandate of Societies, one editorial in 1973 rejects the viability of municipal administration of services and two in 1978 call on the Province to relieve Societies of their protection mandate to enable full concentration on prevention work and counselling.

3. The Citizen

Attempts to review editorials from the Ottawa Citizen since 1968 were unsatisfactory due to a lack of cross-indexed files.

A recent editorial position of The Citizen, however, bears mention because, while it appears to share the Globe's concern regarding lack of Society accountability, it rejects Provincial takeover of services and terms it a simplistic solution: "The implication that government control is the needed panacea and that provincial bureaucrats are immune to fallibility is plain silly". (28)

The solution proposed by The Citizen is to inject more accountability into the present system and open it to public scrutiny rather than transferring responsibility to a new or different bureaucracy. This position was also reflected in editorials dated December 28, 1977, February 3, 1978 and March 27, 1978.

4. Other Newspapers

Having reviewed the three newspapers which published the majority of editorials involving Societies, it is interesting to note the editorial direction of the five remaining newspapers surveyed.

The Kitchener-Waterloo Record published one editorial commenting on Societies in February 1976. (29) It criticized provincial budget cuts and called for adequate funding of Societies.

The Free Press in London commented four times on Societies: once in 1976, twice in 1977 and once in 1978. (30) No consistent position regarding Societies is evident. One editorial calls on Societies to increase their "policing" function to prevent inadequate supervision of children in the community. A second salutes foster parents. The third and fourth editorials comment on child abuse and suggest that the Minister of Community and Social Services should have directed a recent judicial inquiry into the death of a child also to review the policies and practices of all Societies regarding child abuse.

The Sault Star published three editorials: two in 1976 and one in 1970. (31) All are related to foster parents and their contributions to the local Society.

The Spectator in Hamilton has published one editorial on Societies since 1968. (32) In 1971, it called for a review of Societies' administrative operations following public criticism of Societies by the provincial Director of Child Welfare. While noting that Hamilton has one of the best Societies in Ontario, the editorial states that doubts had to be removed to reestablish Society credibility.

The Windsor Star carried one editorial in 1976 calling on the Province to study the possibility of duplication of services between the public and Catholic Societies in Windsor. (33) The call was based on a desire for maximum efficiency following budget cuts and not precipitated by any particular incident in either Society.

5. The Editorials in Perspective

A comprehensive analysis of the impact and relevance of newspaper coverage of Societies would require review and analysis beyond editorial coverage, including news stories, features, and letters to the editor. The editorial review, however limited, does nonetheless help to identify the source and breadth of concern. It is not the intention of this section to analyse the validity of the expressed concerns, but rather to place them in an appropriate context.

It appears that the Globe and Mail stands alone among Ontario newspapers in advocating abolition of Children's Aid Societies and takeover of services by the Province. Only two other papers have commented on the accountability issue, but neither advocates drastic structural change preferring, instead, to see definite steps by the Province to improve the present system.

The Globe believes that services funded by government should be run by government if they are to be adequately accountable for the spending of tax dollars. The delegation of child welfare functions to Societies is seen as a political evasion of responsibility. Even if Societies were to generate their own funding, it is not felt that the responsibility for saving children's lives should rest with volunteers.

The fact that only two other newspapers appear to have taken critical stands, both within the context of continued delegation to Societies, would suggest that there is no groundswell of public sentiment favouring abolition of Societies. The position of the Globe appears to be more of an attempt to shape public opinion than to reflect it.

Comments from newspaper representatives questioned during local field visits tended to confirm this speculation. In general, their coverage of Society work rarely extends beyond calls for or tributes to volunteers or foster parents. The question of Society abolition is simply not an issue and those individuals interviewed reported little public sentiment one way or the other regarding Societies' work. It would appear that, outside of major urban areas, child welfare services and the role played by Societies are not important local issues warranting editorial comment of any significance.

IV ASSESSMENT OF CONCERNS

In the review of current concerns about Children's Aid Societies, two primary critical themes emerge. These involve the structural relevance or appropriateness of Societies and the nature of their accountability relationships.

The purpose of this section is to review the specific aspects of these concerns and to comment on their assessed validity. Comments are based on information gathered on visits to Societies, through the OACAS and study group surveys, and in consultations with the Province, local governments and related constituencies.

A. Accountability Relationship with the Province

Any satisfactory relationship, whether personal or professional, requires the joint efforts of all parties involved. In this case the major actors are the Societies and the Province through the Ministry of Community and Social Services. There is a compulsory relationship dictated by the terms of The Child Welfare Act.

The relationship is characterized by an understanding that Societies will administer and deliver provincial child welfare services in exchange for which the Province will provide no less than 80 percent of the monies approved to fulfill these statutory functions. Implicit is the understanding that, as private corporations with delegated public responsibilities and funding, Societies will be held accountable to the Province for the adequate delivery of services and the appropriate use of funds.

Inherent tensions arise in the relationship due to the quasi-public status of Societies and the subsequent balancing act between public and private authority and power. The Province, while recognizing the rights and independence of the private Societies, must hold them accountable for the delivery of mandatory services and the use of public funds. The Societies, conversely, while retaining their independence as private corporations accountable to themselves, must also account to a public authority. It is a complex and politically sensitive relationship.

As a result, the relationship has been characterized by varying degrees of ambiguity, adversity and suspicion aggravated by a lack of clarity regarding expectations and inadequate mechanisms for accountability.

For example, The Child Welfare Act requires Children's Aid Societies to fulfill minimum standards of service delivery. Concern has been expressed that Societies have fallen short of accountability requirements in this area. The Societies, however, claim willingness to meet whatever standards are set but point to the fact that provincial standards do not exist for most of the functions which the Societies are required to fulfill. The Province, itself, has had official responsibility since 1965 for standards and is currently involved in an extensive process of standards development.

Adequate mechanisms for both service and funding accountability to the Province could exist through reporting requirements and the establishment of standards. However, the usefulness of these mechanisms is questionable unless resources are reallocated to allow their full implementation. Similarly, voluntary standards developed through OACAS can have little effect without Provincial recognition and support. Therefore, to meet even basic accountability expectations, the Societies and the Province must reach clear agreement on their mutual expectations and commitments.

Until the Province meets its obligation to develop and enforce standards, it is difficult to assess the ability of Societies to fulfill them. Thus, while concerns regarding lack of Society accountability to the Province may be justified, the Province must accept a major part of the responsibility for this problem. As the Hanson Report observed: "Horses that are improperly fed and trained cannot be blamed for losing races". (34)

B. Accountability Relationship with Local Governments

The Societies also have a mandatory relationship with local governments which are required by The Child Welfare Act to provide funding for 20 percent of each Society's approved estimate of net expenditures. In return, Societies are required to accept four municipal councillors on the Executive Committees of their Boards of Directors.

Municipal officials have expressed resentment of the requirement to fund the services of any bodies over which they have no authority, e.g., Boards of Education and Children's Aid Societies. While the Province has the legal right to enforce standards and expect direct reports from Societies, accountability to local governments depends largely upon the relationship between Societies and the municipal councillors on their Boards. The only other legal requirement of Societies regarding local governments is that they submit an annual estimate of net expenditures for the following year with local councils. If municipalities do not agree with the estimates or the portion referable to them, they may request a hearing before a provincial

The extent of accountability to local governments thus depends largely on the motivation and capabilities of the individuals most directly involved, namely, Society Board members and municipal representatives on the Board. The ambiguity inherent in this type of relationship leads to tremendous variation in the quality of the relationship and subsequent accountability to local government.

A number of Societies visited by the study group reported excellent relations with their municipal councillors and usually, as a result, with the local government. Others complained that councillors attend Board meetings only sporadically and focus too much attention on costs rather than quality of services. Some Societies also noted that the limited municipal term of office prevents continuity in municipal participation.

Councillors also reported a wide range in the nature of their relationships with Societies. Some enjoy excellent relations while others claimed they are excluded from decision-making, denied information and treated with suspicion by Society Board and staff members. Most of those interviewed by the study group agreed that it took them nearly two years to reach any understanding of their role on the Society Board.

Local politicians not serving on Society Boards often reported little awareness of current Society activities and functioning. Some local councillors outlined many general criticisms of Societies and yet, when pressed, admitted that they have not asked the municipal councillors working with the local Society to inform the Society of their concerns. Thus, lack of communication and appropriate use of municipal representatives have, in some cases, undermined the relationship.

The relationship between Societies and local governments appears to suffer from a lack of clearly defined expectations. Councillors are often given no direction from their councils or committees regarding their role on Society Boards. Few reported adequate orientation from Societies when they joined the Board. Several councillors expressed frustration at feeling caught in the middle, with little support from either councils or Society Boards, and yet feeling the responsibility of representing both to each other. It is not surprising that Society accountability to local governments has been identified as a problem.

With the proposed creation of local children's services committees and the vesting of authority in local governments, a dramatic change in the relationship between Societies and local governments is likely to occur. In the meantime, both Societies and local governments must share responsibility for the present problems in their relationship and subsequent poor accountability.

C. Accountability to the Community and Consumers

Concerns have been expressed that Societies often function in isolation from the community, are overly secretive and authoritarian about their work, and appear unresponsive to community needs. If this is true, the people who fund and use Society services have justifiable reason to be concerned. Recognizing that no legal provisions exist requiring consumer and community accountability, the study group believes that Societies are nonetheless both morally and professionally bound to develop mechanisms to ensure responsiveness to local expectations.

Accountability to the community requires that the community involve itself in the work of Societies and that Societies involve themselves in the work of the community. Again, a satisfactory relationship involving mutual commitment is necessary to achieve accountability particularly when no mechanisms exist in law.

Community members may presently involve themselves in Societies by becoming Society members and/or volunteers. The membership then elects the Society Board which is usually, depending upon Society by-laws, open to everyone except minors, non-residents and, often, staff.

Judging from the results of the study group survey of Societies, the importance attached by many Societies to membership and volunteer programs is minimal. As reported, only 32.6 percent of Societies have active membership committees and only a little over half engaged in active recruitment of volunteers last year. Almost 20 percent of the Societies could offer no reasons for having memberships and 37.2 percent reported zero to ten volunteers. Regardless of the reasons, the effects result in weakened accountability to the community.

Survey results suggest that Society membership and volunteer programs are most viable in larger communities with the traditions, resources and expertise to support their development. It is not unrealistic to suggest that Societies tend to reflect the predominant values of the communities they serve. If the community is prepared and able to demand accountability, the Society is more likely to respond. If, however, local traditions or conditions discourage active community interest or involvement, the Societies are unlikely to initiate extensive programs for community involvement.

The fact that a significant number of Societies do not appear to feel obliged to take the leadership in actively soliciting members and volunteers brings into question their claim to be community-based organizations. It appears that many Societies have much more work to do if they are to receive a clear community mandate in practice as well as theory.

The services of Societies are available to any child or family in Ontario in need of assistance regarding matters of child welfare. In some cases, these services are sought on a voluntary basis. In others, they are provided through court order based on the mandate of Societies to protect children from physical or psychological harm. Implicit in the expectation of Society accountability to the community is the concept of direct accountability to consumers, those members of the community making direct use of Society services.

Few Society structures reflect a commitment to the philosophy of accountability to consumers of service. Only 32 present or former consumers are represented on Society Boards. At least 30 Societies offer consumers no recourse to the Board in the event of a complaint. Societies selected for direct consultation rarely considered consumer consultation or involvement an issue of concern.

In short, while Societies may be committed to providing the best possible services to consumers, they rarely have specific mechanisms for direct consumer accountability. For those to whom this is a necessary feature of effective and appropriate service, there is justifiable cause for concern about Societies' ability to incorporate this feature into their structure or programs.

D. Society Boards of Directors

As the governing bodies of Societies, the Boards of Directors are accountable for the policies and practices of their Societies. These Boards have been labelled at various times as unrepresentative, inefficient, rubber-stamp bodies which are irrelevant to adequate provision of service.

The survey results support the observation that Society Boards are not usually representative of the communities they serve. In general, Boards are composed primarily of individuals who are white anglo-saxon professionals in management or human services. In communities with large numbers of racial, ethnic, occupational or economic groupings, representation on the Society Board from these constituencies is rarely evident. As previously noted, consumers represent only 3.7 percent of the total Society Board membership.

While it may be argued that representativeness does not necessarily ensure a viable Board, it does help the Board to remain directly in touch with the major segments of its community and provides an additional mechanism for community accountability. Broad representation helps the Board to adopt policies and programs most appropriate to the needs of the total community. The Society, as a whole, is then able to be a more viable, relevant force in its community.

Acclamation of Board elections seems to be the rule rather than the exception in many Societies. Almost 40 percent of those surveyed had acclaimed every Board election since 1968 while only 16.3 percent had acclaimed none. This does not necessarily indicate that Boards are stagnating. In fact, almost 60 percent of present Board members have served less than three years. It does, however, suggest limited community interest and the possible perpetuation of certain interests which, as noted, are not particularly representative of their total communities.

During the course of field visits to Societies, the study group observed a variety of Boards in operation. Several appeared energetic, committed and extremely well-informed. Others exhibited little understanding of their role and seemed unable to address the broad issues affecting child welfare. The quality of the Board also appeared to have an impact on staff members who, when led by a vital Board, seemed to be better informed and have a higher morale than did staff with ineffectual Boards.

In attempting to identify the factors which make one Board flourish while another flounders, the study group concluded that a primary factor seems to be the style of the local director. In practice, many directors directly choose or heavily influence the choosing of a slate of nominations for the Board. If his or her style is enhanced by a viable, working Board, it is possible to create that type of Board. If, conversely, the director prefers a well-intentioned but passive Board which will endorse most proposals coming its way, this, too, appears to be within his or her control. A similar process may occur in the selection of staff to complement the director's style.

The Board also depends largely on the director for its information. Particularly on Boards with no consumer or staff representation, the director is often the only person who has a clear idea of how the Society is actually operating. This gives the director great freedom in deciding what information should or should not go to the Board. While this is a power which, of course, is not always abused, the fact remains that it can be and has been.

The singular influence of local directors over their Boards is further reinforced by The Child Welfare Act which prescribes no relationship between Society Boards and the Province. The Act does, however, dictate that the local director will cooperate with the Director of Child Welfare. Accordingly, Ministry officials work with Societies through their local directors and admit having little or no contact with the Boards. This practice tends to further undermine the governing role of the Board and reinforce the central control of local directors.

The role of Society Boards has undergone changes over the years with the professionalization of social work and the introduction of public funding. If Board members don't need to raise money and don't deliver the direct services, what do they do? Their purpose, as defined by The Child Welfare Act, is to govern. Governing includes many possible activities but some Board members express uncertainty about what their function actually is. Many observe that by the time they finish negotiating and renegotiating budgets, there is time for little else.

The Hanson Report suggested that two prime Board functions could be recruiting volunteers and raising funds for innovative projects. (35) Study group research, however, indicates that Board members are not usually involved in either activity, or, if they are, do not seem to be having great success as illustrated by the disparity in the distribution of volunteers and the relatively few additional grants received by Societies in the past ten years.

The major concerns regarding Society Boards do appear to have some basis in fact. The present Board system is extremely loose, making it subject to abuse or manipulation by any group or individual willing to make the effort. While this type of flexibility can be a strength as well as a weakness, in too many cases it appears to have resulted in the creation of non-representative, director-controlled Society Boards which function in isolation from the community.

V A BRIDGE TO THE FUTURE

We have identified and assessed the validity of a number of concerns regarding Children's Aid Society structure and relationships. All have been raised at various times by various sources for at least the last decade. Yet few significant changes have occurred as a result.

There are those who feel that Societies are not capable of making the necessary improvements to their structure and relationships and that responsibility for child welfare should be vested in another body. Others claim that the continuing weaknesses of the present system are largely a result of government ambivalence and that, with adequate support, Societies can respond to the challenges of the future.

It is possible that the Province may ultimately decide to vest responsibility for child welfare in a body other than Societies. It is also possible that the present mandate of Societies will be reaffirmed. The possibility of future restructuring of the child welfare system, however, does not preclude the need for improvements to the present system in the interim period.

For this reason the study group offers on the following pages a number of suggestions which are designed to strengthen the present system. These are not intended to eliminate the need for a clear government commitment either to support the continued development of Societies or to vest child welfare authority elsewhere. Rather, the suggested improvements are offered in the belief that children should not suffer while policy is being debated.

A. Accountability Relationship with the Province

1. Design and Enforce Standards

The Province should continue its activities to develop comprehensive standards for all child welfare services and design mechanisms for their implementation and enforcement as soon as possible.

In addition, further consideration could be given by both Societies and the Province to ways of encouraging service development and delivery beyond the minimum acceptable level dictated by standards. A system of accreditation based on achievement of higher than minimum standards may be a possible mechanism.

2. Define the Relationship

Every attempt should be made to develop a clear statement describing the relationship and mutual expectations and responsibilities of both the Province and the Societies within and beyond the requirements of The Child Welfare Act.

This statement could be published and distributed to all concerned individuals and organizations. While an informal understanding may be evolving among senior Society and Ministry staff, this does little to address the confusion which abounds at other levels.

3. Improve Consultation and Communication

The present decentralization of Ministry staff to area offices holds many possibilities for enhancing the relationship between the Province and the Societies. Until now, Societies have had little visible contact with the Ministry beyond special communiques or directives, investigations or contact between Ministry staff and Society local directors.

It might, for example, be desirable to have a Ministry consultant attend Society Board meetings on a regular basis in the future. In this way, the consultant could gain a clearer understanding of Society work and potential tension or conflicts between Societies and the Province might be averted.

4. Expand Advisory Mechanism

Major studies over the years have identified the need for a formal Provincial child welfare advisory body. Various attempts have been made but the need still exists for the Province to establish an advisory mechanism designed to involve not only Society local directors, but also Society Board members and other volunteers, Society staff and consumers, foster parents, and individuals from related constituencies. Such a body could help the Province to design policies and guidelines in tune with local needs. The establishment of local children's services committees would not preclude the need for a province-wide advisory body on child welfare.

B. Accountability Relationship with Local Governments

1. Define the Relationship

Each Society and local municipal council or social services committee could meet to negotiate the terms and expectations of their relationship. Although the relationship would change with the advent of local children's services committees, it will be a number of years before this process is complete. Now is not too early for Societies to improve communication with the local governments to whom they will eventually be accountable. The negotiated agreement could then be widely distributed.

2. Define the Role of Councillors on Society Boards

As intermediaries between Societies and local councils, councillors appointed to Society Boards could play a crucial role in facilitating communication and averting potential problems.

Both Society Boards and local councils could make greater efforts to orient councillors to their role on Society Boards as quickly and thoroughly as possible in order to maximize their contribution during their terms of office.

Societies could state the minimum time required from their municipal representatives and council could then make every effort to appoint councillors who can fulfill these requirements. When councillors are unable to attend Society Board meetings, every effort could be made to inform them of decisions or consult with them in advance.

3. Improve Consultation and Communication

Representatives of Society Board and staff could offer to meet with local councils or their social services committee at least twice a year to discuss common interests and concerns. Again, this could help to establish mutual understanding and encourage cooperation.

If such meetings are not practical, councillors on Society Boards could arrange to make regular reports to their colleagues regarding Society activities and progress. In addition, they could be encouraged to report any concerns or reactions of councils directly to the Society Boards and local director.

C. Accountability to the Community and Consumers

1. Expand Society Membership and Volunteer Programs

Since Societies are publicly funded, membership should be seen as the right of all citizens and taxpayers. All restrictions on or deterrents to membership should therefore be removed. Guidelines could be developed for members who may experience conflicts of interest around certain issues.

Societies which have had difficulty in defining a role for members could ask their existing members to help organize a drive for members and volunteers. Although the initial effort is great, this is a long-term investment which could revitalize Societies, extend their community base, allow initiation of new projects using volunteers, and even generate funding for innovative or short-term projects.

2. Create Advisory Committees

Accountability could be enhanced and services improved through the use of local advisory committees. They could be committees representing consumers, ethnic, geographic and special interest groups, related service organizations and the general community. They could also be a valuable training ground for future Society Board membership.

Special efforts would be needed to involve consumers who have not traditionally been consulted about or involved in the work of Societies. Consumer involvement in advisory committees could facilitate the identification of needs and more reliable evaluation of existing programs.

As local children's services committees evolve, these child welfare advisory committees could either continue under the auspices of Societies or be absorbed into the advisory components of the local committees.

3. Create Mechanisms for Complaints and Evaluation

It may be appropriate that most complaints from consumers, staff volunteers or other individuals be resolved at the staff level. However, it is desirable that Societies create a mechanism for appeal to the Board and clearly inform people of their right to a hearing.

All complaints, including those resolved by staff, should be documented and reported regularly to the Board. In this way, the Board would have access to information which could allow early detection of recurring problems.

In addition, accountability could be enhanced through the establishment of standardized methods for evaluation of services by consumers. The Board and staff should receive regular reports based on consumer reaction to services.

4. Go to the Community

Beyond participation in activities or on Boards of other service agencies, Societies could do much to extend their community base. Community meetings could be held in different locations to inform people of activities, learn their concerns and invite their participation. Promotional material could be developed and distributed at various community functions. Such activities would not only enhance the Society's public image but could also encourage direct donations of time and money.

Creative use of the media could also heighten community sensitivity to child welfare concerns. Boards could establish public relations committees of volunteers which could draw on community resources to develop creative and informative educational campaigns.

D. Society Boards of Directors

1. Open the Boards

Societies should move to open all Board meetings to the general public, including Society staff. In addition, representatives of related agencies could be encouraged to attend on a regular basis as observers. This open policy would enable the Board to consider a variety of viewpoints in developing policies.

Board minutes or quarterly reports could be circulated to the media and specific organizations to keep them informed of developments and upcoming projects.

Such moves could help to alleviate concerns that Societies operate in a secretive, closed fashion. They would also improve community accountability by providing the public with regular information and access to the Board if desired.

2. Tighten Election Procedures and Increase Representativeness

To reduce concerns that Society Boards are often "hand-picked" or "self-perpetuating", elections by acclamation should be the exception rather than the rule. The Nominating Committee could, instead of developing a limited slate of nominees, concentrate on soliciting as many nominations as possible through membership mailings and community contact. Nominees could then be familiarized with the role of the Board and the nature of their expected commitment. Finally, all advance nominations could be circulated to members prior to the Annual Meeting with additional nominations being permitted from the floor.

To increase community representativeness, the Board might wish to consider by-laws requiring representation of certain constituencies on the Board, e.g. consumers, major ethnic groups, or labour organizations. Particular effort could be made to solicit nominations from constituencies not normally represented on the Board.

3. Develop Standards for Society Structure

Service standards are both desirable and necessary. Quality of service, however, can also be damaged by problems of structure and administration. If Societies are not able to bring the structure and functions of their governing bodies up to acceptable levels through their own initiative, the Province could consider developing standards for structure.

For example, minimum standards for structure could include provisions for Society Boards' elections, composition and functions, Society membership and volunteers. Guidelines could also be developed for community involvement and accountability, relationships between Boards and their local director, the Province, local governments and, eventually, children's services committees.

4. Expand Training Programs for Board Members

The annual OACAS Conference usually offers training workshops for Board members. Most Board members, many of whom are otherwise employed, are not able to take full advantage of these occasions. Some Societies offer extensive orientation programs for new Board members while others offer virtually no orientation.

As a result, there is a great variation in the capabilities of Board members. Individuals who have never worked on a Board or do not feel confident in their new role, are offered limited opportunities to develop their capacities. Accordingly, it is not surprising to find some Boards dominated either by articulate, experienced professionals or by inexperienced volunteers who, through lack of knowledge, virtually rubber-stamp proposals from the local director.

An extensive provincially-sponsored training program for new or potential Society Board members could help to upgrade the quality of Society Boards. In fact, some Ministry officials have already expressed interest in the idea. The program could be offered on a regional basis and run jointly by OACAS and the Ministry.

5. Improve Coordination and Information-Sharing

OACAS coordinates regional meetings of local directors and Board presidents. The average Board member, however, seems painfully unaware of developments in other Societies unless there is a crisis.

While it is neither practical nor possible to expect every Board member to travel around the province visiting other Societies, it is possible to suggest that information-sharing between adjacent Societies on the Board level could be of mutual benefit.

The body presently responsible for coordination and information-sharing among Societies is OACAS. The consensus among those consulted by the study group, however, is that OACAS is falling far short of its mandate in this area. Board and staff members generally expressed little awareness of OACAS activities or those in other Societies.

Local Societies also share some responsibility for problems of coordination. In many cases, local directors and Board presidents have failed to transmit information from OACAS meetings or bulletins to their staff and Board members. This, of course, further reduces the potential impact of OACAS efforts.

The task of coordinating the efforts of 51 Societies with differing priorities and political perspectives is a difficult one. Lack of consensus appears to have had a paralyzing effect on the ability of OACAS to maximize the efforts of Societies beyond those directed at self-preservation. A major re-evaluation of its purpose and direction could perhaps make OACAS a more effective and relevant force in the field of child welfare.

PART TWO - OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

I DEVELOPING A FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSMENT

Based upon an understanding of the historical evolution and present practices of Ontario's child welfare structure and relationships, the study group identified the following administrative models to be assessed for their potential viability in Ontario: provincial administration, municipal administration, quasi-public administration and local children's services committee administration.

It is not the purpose of the study to recommend a particular option. That will be the task of policy makers following extensive public consultation. The intent, instead, is to provide a framework for discussion, debate and action.

Based on the philosophy outlined in the Introduction to the study, a number of characteristics may be identified as desirable features of a child welfare system. (36) These will be used to measure the strengths and weaknesses of each option under consideration.

Characteristics are listed below in alphabetical order rather than ranked in order of importance. Preferred options, however, will flow from these characteristics depending upon the priority accorded to each. Choice of priorities will depend upon each reader's individual philosophy toward child welfare.

- o Accountability: ability to deliver, measure and evaluate services in a manner which corresponds to the expectations of funders, consumers and the general community; ability to answer to government for use of public funds and quality of service; ability to involve consumers and the general community in the planning and administration of services based, when possible, on shared perceptions of need.
- o Advocacy Ability: ability to engage in independent action with and on behalf of consumers to change policies, programs, laws or institutions which endanger the welfare of children or threaten their basic human rights.
- o Coordination: ability, based on both willingness and experience, to make appropriate connections with other internal and external services and programs.

- o Effectiveness: ability to meet basic service standards; ability to innovate and experiment with new programs and methods; ability to set goals and objectives, evaluate results and make necessary adjustments.
- o Availability: ability to ensure that services are available and easily accessible to any person in need.
- o Flexibility: ability to allow for regional, cultural, economic and developmental differences in the design and delivery of services.

The options assessment will balance the strengths and weakness of each model against these characteristics. The potential effects of local children's services committees on each model will then be examined. Finally, an analysis of the political implications of each option will be offered.

Child welfare is only one of many services which will be affected by the current reorganization of children's services. Many issues remain unresolved at this stage in the process. For this reason, the study group found it necessary to make a number of assumptions regarding future policies and developments affecting child welfare. The assessment of child welfare options for the future is based on the following assumptions:

- o Local children's services committees will be established throughout the province. It is too early to tell exactly what form these committees might take in structure or composition. However, current policy suggests that they will allow for broad participation of elected local officials, service providers, citizens and consumers.
- o No single model of child welfare will serve the needs of the total province. The study attempts to assess the optimum conditions for the implementation of each model.
- o Provincial standards for all child welfare services will be operational and will include methods of ensuring adherence.
- o Provincial mechanisms for funding child welfare services will be streamlined.

Experience has shown, however, that nothing is ever guaranteed in the political arena. If, for some reason, future developments preclude the establishment of local children's services committees, we do not believe that the options assessment would be invalidated. The potential of each option, with the obvious exception of local children's services committee administration, would remain relatively unchanged. The anticipated benefits of systematic local coordination and needs assessment through local committees would, however, be lost.

II PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION

A. Description

This model is characterized by provincial government responsibility for the administration and delivery of all statutory child welfare services. Service delivery would no longer be delegated to Children's Aid Societies but would be carried out by civil service staff of the Children's Services Division of the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Services would probably be funded by provincial monies although some provinces have levied municipalities for portions of basic costs. Child welfare staff would be directly accountable through the Children's Services Division to the Minister. The delivery mechanism for services would be area Ministry offices.

B. Example

Provincial administration is the model of child welfare service delivery in most Canadian provinces and territories including Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia and the Yukon and Northwest Territories. The child welfare system in Alberta perhaps provides the clearest example of a provincially administered system.

Under the authority of the Alberta Child Welfare Act, services are delivered by the Child Welfare Branch of the provincial Department of Social Services and Community Health. Programs are administered through 37 regional offices. They include protection, services to unmarried parents, adoption, juvenile corrections, and residential, foster and institutional care.

The social services departments of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary provide juvenile probation services in those two cities. A cost-sharing agreement between the local and provincial government has been established for these services.

In addition, private agencies or individuals are contracted by the Province to provide most group homes and institutional services. Preventive programs are also arranged primarily on a private or municipal contract basis.

The Child Welfare Branch in Alberta notes that evaluation has not been a strong point of the system and that little effort has been made to assess the strengths or weaknesses of the system. (37) Other research, however, shows the system to be highly centralized with very standardized services. While centralization may ensure that basic programs are uniformly available around the province, some observers feel that it has also made the system unresponsive to varying local needs and relatively inflexible.

Alberta reports one of the highest rates of children in care in Canada. (38) There are a number of possible reasons for this. For example, Alberta, unlike Saskatchewan, provides service to the native and metis populations which make up a relatively high percentage of the total population and of the number of children in care. This may tend to present a somewhat distorted picture of Alberta's services in comparison to other provinces.

Many variables contribute to determining the number of children in care. However, it would appear that systems like the one found in Alberta which are highly centralized and subject to direct political influence tend to have a higher number of children in care than do systems which are decentralized and further removed from political control. This perhaps suggests that the proximity of a child welfare system to a political structure may encourage apprehension of children in order to avoid any potential crisis and its subsequent political consequences.

C. Evaluation of Potential for Use in Ontario

1. Accountability

a) To funders:

A provincially administered child welfare system would be highly accountable to its direct funder, the Provincial Government. The Minister of Community and Social Services would be directly answerable in the Legislature for the actions of his or her staff.

b) To the community:

Community accountability could be relatively poor in a provincially administered system because final decision-making would rest with the central authority with little input required from local communities.

Furthermore, a provincial system cannot be held accountable to local government. Thus, in Ontario, responsibility for child welfare would need to be eliminated from the projected mandate of local children's services committees. Community accountability would then become only a discretionary feature of a provincial child welfare system.

The centralized decision-making power of a provincial system could deter extensive community involvement. Regardless of mechanisms for local consultation, the control over services would remain with the Province. Experience in Prince Edward Island suggests that even when provincial services are locally delivered, the community tends to feel that services are simply "parachuted" in and assumes little responsibility for them. (39)

Accountability to local communities could be enhanced by the establishment of locally or regionally appointed or elected advisory committees. Such bodies would need to be non-partisan and broadly representative in character in order to balance the strong central political influence on services.

Community participation could be strengthened through the development of appropriate programs for involvement and consultation. This would require a commitment not only to go out and consult the community but also to provide vehicles for direct community involvement. Volunteer programs, for example, could offer involvement in policy development, program planning and evaluation as well as direct service.

c) To consumers:

Consumer accountability is not a functional characteristic of any existing provincial or territorial system of child welfare. This fact suggests that accountability to consumers would not be an inherent feature of a provincially administered child welfare system in Ontario. It could, however, be enhanced through the representation of consumers on local or regional advisory committees and the initiation of consumer-oriented and self-help programs. The establishment of formal and accessible mechanisms for receiving consumer complaints and evaluation of service would also strengthen accountability.

In order to reflect accountability to consumers in practice, a provincial child welfare system would require a firm philosophic commitment to this principle. If necessary, programs could be restructured and staff re-oriented to ensure that services were planned and delivered in a manner which encouraged active involvement of consumers.

2. Advocacy Ability

A provincially administered child welfare system would be directly subject to governmental interference and shifting political priorities. Child welfare staff would be employed by government as civil servants. These realities would severely limit the freedom of staff to organize to change government laws, policies or programs which acted against the interests of children and their families.

The advocacy ability of a provincial system could be enhanced by the creation of an independent, non-partisan advocacy body removed from the administrative structure and free from political pressure. Such a body could help to ensure that the needs and rights of children always remained the first concern. It could also offer consumers an ultimate mechanism for appeal in the event of unresolved complaints.

3. Coordination

Coordination among provincial child welfare offices would be encouraged by the centralized nature of the system. However, experience in Prince Edward Island and some American states suggests that although provincial or state child welfare systems have extensive expertise at their disposal, coordination with other government departments often presents as many difficulties as coordination among non-government services.

Assuming that other children's services would still become the responsibility of local government, provincial retention of the child welfare mandate could pose serious problems. Traditional conflicts and tensions between provincial and local officials could inhibit coordination of child welfare services with other children's services. This could result in gaps or duplication in service for children or families requiring services beyond those offered by provincial child welfare authorities.

Coordination could be enhanced by the creation of locally appointed child welfare advisory bodies which would not only function as advisors to the Minister but could also act as liaisons between provincial child welfare services and children's services being coordinated through local government.

4. Effectiveness

The ability of a provincial child welfare system to monitor and meet basic service standards would be excellent. Efforts to innovate or improve services beyond minimum required levels, however, could be deterred by the Minister's knowledge that funds were not available to pay for improved levels of service or that proposed improvements were in conflict with provincial priorities. Such deterrents would severely limit any potential for excellence.

The effectiveness of a provincial system could be enhanced by the involvement of local communities and consumers through advisory and advocacy mechanisms. These groups could help to articulate the need for improved or innovative services and to promote the interests of children over funding or political constraints.

5. Availability

A provincial child welfare system would generally ensure that services were uniformly available in every part of the province.

6. Flexibility

Provincial programs tend to be standardized and uniform across the province. While this would be a strength in many aspects of child welfare services, it could discourage flexible response to varying regional or individual needs.

Flexibility could be enhanced by maximizing the autonomy of area offices and establishing methods of consultation with front-line staff, consumers and local communities. Area office autonomy could encourage greater local involvement which could result in more appropriate and flexible methods and mechanisms for service delivery.

D. Effects of Local Children's Services Committees

The establishment of local children's services committees under local government authority practically precludes the suitability of a provincially administered child welfare system. The projected purpose of local committees is to facilitate local coordination of the entire spectrum of children's services. To remove child welfare from that spectrum would undoubtedly damage the ability of both the local and provincial systems to effectively serve the needs of children and their families.

If such a division in responsibility were to occur, special mechanisms would need to be created to ensure coordination of local and provincial services in both policy and program areas. Liaison could be pursued through locally appointed provincial child welfare advisory committees. Coordination of local and provincial services on the community level would require clear agreement on mutual roles and responsibilities.

The relative benefits of a provincial child welfare system, particularly in the areas of political accountability and uniformity of services, would need to be balanced against the potential problems of coordination with other services under local government authority. At best it is a weak alternative.

E. Political Implications

Present provincial policies and activities favour a shifting of responsibility for most children's services, including child welfare, to local government. This direction makes the creation of a provincial child welfare system very unlikely within the present political context.

Furthermore, Ontario has traditionally shared the costs of child welfare with municipal governments. A provincially administered child welfare system could preclude extensive cost-sharing by local governments for provincial services over which they had no authority or control. While local areas might welcome some relief from property taxed contributions to child welfare services, the Ministry would have great difficulty finding provincial resources to replace lost municipal contributions.

If a provincial child welfare system were created, the provincial government could face certain political consequences.

For example, the Minister would be immediately answerable and directly accountable in the Legislature for the services provided by his or her staff. Blame for mistakes could not be deflected to a Children's Aid Society or a local government.

The proximity of service delivery to the political system could also have certain implications for services. To avoid possible political embarrassment, a reduction in responsible risk-taking might occur. For example, staff might be directed or feel compelled to remove a child from his or her home at the first sign of trouble rather than giving other alternatives a fair chance. This tendency is suggested by the relatively high numbers of children in care in some provincially administered systems. (40) Thus, the long-term interests of the child might tend to be overshadowed by the short-term interests of politics.

Governments are usually very wary of potential adversary situations due to their reliance upon continuing voter support. This concern could discourage practical support of extensive community or consumer involvement in the design, delivery or evaluation of child welfare services. Emphasis could tend, instead, to be given to selective community 'consultation' rather than real involvement.

Experience in other jurisdictions indicates that provincial administration of services is most suitable in small and/or homogeneous areas where uniform, standardized practices are more appropriate and local traditions do not oppose central authority.

III MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION

A. Description

This model is characterized by municipal government responsibility for the delivery of all statutory child welfare services. Services would no longer be delivered by Children's Aid Societies but would be administered through local departments of social services. It is assumed that present cost-sharing arrangements with the Province would be continued.

The local departments would likely be accountable to local councils through the local children's services committee. Services would be delivered through local department offices by civic child welfare staff.

B. Example

Municipal administration of child welfare systems is common in a number of countries including the United Kingdom, Denmark, Yugoslavia, Germany and some American states. No Canadian province has a municipal child welfare system. For the purposes of example, the United Kingdom perhaps provides the clearest illustration of how such a system operates in a country not dissimilar to Canada. (41)

In the U.K., local governments are responsible for all personal social services including child welfare. Services are delivered through local departments of social services which are accountable to elected local officials who serve on social services sub-committees of councils.

In England, local authorities are responsible to the central government through the Department of Health and Social Security. Local governments are given great breadth in designing and administering services in the manner most suitable to their area. They must, however, maintain standards and implement policies developed by the central government. Central control is also reinforced through funding support.

A major strength of this system appears to be its flexibility and responsiveness to local needs. For example, a number of local authorities have decentralized their service delivery units to defined geographical areas. As a result, physical access to services has been made easier and more people seem to identify with "their" local community service than with the previous centralized service. Other local authorities are experimenting with a community development approach to public education and liaison with voluntary agencies upon whom they depend for most referrals for service. Thus, while bound to statutory responsibilities and central standards, many local authorities have used their autonomy to develop innovative, community-based programs.

While responsive to local needs, the system has not however been without problems. The identification of previously unmet needs and the wide variations in locally identified needs make the systematic, central distribution of resources difficult. In some cases, a local authority wishing to act in an area where the central government is resistant may lack the necessary authority or funding to proceed. Thus, any conflict between the two levels of government tends to retard services.

C. Evaluation of Potential for Use in Ontario

1. Accountability

a) To funders:

A municipal child welfare system in Ontario could be held highly accountable to its local funder, the municipal government. Adherence to provincial service standards could also ensure fair accountability to the Province. Potential conflict might result, however, from differences between provincial policy priorities and local interpretation of needs.

b) To the community:

Accountability to the local community could be enforced through the local council, its elected representatives and the local children's services committee. The fact that most decision-making would occur at the local level could also encourage community consultation and involvement.

Although there have been exceptions, municipal social services in Ontario have not traditionally had a high community profile or received broad community participation perhaps, in part, due to the residual nature of their services and their primary association with welfare.

Given the necessary authority and support, however, a municipal child welfare system could exhibit a fair degree of community accountability. For example, the establishment of community advisory bodies, volunteer and public education programs could help to enhance this feature.

c) To consumers:

Most municipal social services in Ontario have demonstrated little ability to involve consumers in the planning, administration or evaluation of services. Consumers do, however, have direct access to elected officials if they have a complaint. This could encourage a municipal child welfare system to be responsive to consumer involvement and consultation. Levels of accountability to consumers, however, would be subject to local variations in values, resources and expertise.

Representation of consumers on local advisory or planning committees could enhance consumer accountability. Formal mechanisms for consumer complaints and evaluation of service could also strengthen this feature.

2. Advocacy Ability

The ability of a municipal child welfare system to advocate with or on behalf of consumers would probably be reduced by its proximity to the political system and its dependence upon tax-based local funding.

Being separate from the provincial government, a municipal child welfare system could exert pressure on the Province for changes in policy or funding to benefit children. Incentive for these activities, however, could be reduced by the awareness of local politicians that changes requiring additional funding would place further demands on limited municipal property tax bases. Civic child welfare staff might therefore experience resistance from local officials in pursuing extensive advocacy programs.

The advocacy ability of a municipal child welfare system could be strengthened through the creation of community advocacy and advisory bodies responsible, first and foremost, for representing the interests of children to both the Province and local governments. Local children's services committees might be able to fulfill part of this role. In addition, programs for consumer involvement and careful monitoring of consumer complaints and evaluation of service could enhance advocacy ability. Success, however, would again depend upon local values, resources and expertise.

3. Coordination

The coordination abilities of a municipal child welfare system would vary from area to area depending upon available resources and expertise. Local coordination with other services would be facilitated by local children's services committees. Province-wide coordination, however, could be hampered by varying procedures, practices and priorities from one area to another.

Coordination could be enhanced by the establishment of a province-wide information and service committee among local deliverers of child welfare services.

4. Effectiveness

A municipal child welfare system could meet the basic service requirements of Provincial standards. Ability to enhance services beyond the minimum through innovation or expansion, however, could be deterred by limited local tax bases. Again, success would be subject to variations in local values, resources and expertise.

5. Availability

Adherence to minimum service standards would ensure that basic services were generally available across the province.

6. Flexibility

A municipal child welfare system could allow great variation across the province in mechanisms and methods of service delivery to accommodate locally-defined needs. The degree to which each area would be flexible enough to meet the varying needs among particular groups or individuals would vary according to local values, resources and expertise.

Thus, although the system would be structurally flexible on a province-wide basis, its ability to be flexible to the varying needs within its own community would be subject to variations.

D. Effects of Local Children's Services Committees

The establishment of local children's services committees could enhance the potential of a municipally administered child welfare system. Local committees would provide an additional accountability mechanism beyond local councils which could help to promote progressive child welfare practices and programs within the terms of provincial legislation, standards and policies. In addition, local committees could help to ensure that child welfare receives appropriate attention from local governments and does not lose its priority to roads, sewers, or general welfare assistance.

As bodies separate from local or provincial government, local committees might also help to avert potential provincial-municipal conflicts over service priorities. They would also facilitate coordination of municipal child welfare services with other community services to children.

The distinct features of the relationships are not known at this time. Potential conflict could arise unless clear agreement is reached among all parties regarding accountability and reporting procedures. For example, would municipal child welfare services be directly accountable to local committees or to local councils? What authority would the Province retain? These questions would remain unanswered until local committees were fully developed.

E. Political Implications

The creation of a municipal child welfare system in Ontario would not conflict with current Provincial policy which favours decentralization of authority for services delivery to the local level. Although the Minister would remain ultimately accountable for the provision of services, local governments would become directly responsible for delivery of child welfare services in their own areas. Public attention would become clearly focussed on local authorities in the event of problems.

A municipally-administered child welfare system, however, also has political implications which could affect services. For example, while local governments have demonstrated an ability to activate and involve local communities around certain issues, child welfare lies beyond the realm of their traditional expertise. Human services have not generally been a local priority and councillors are usually elected on platforms related to 'hard' services such as sewers and roads. The ability of local councils to respond to the needs of children in an appropriate and sensitive fashion could be subject to tremendous variation. The potential for conflict on the local level between conservative and liberal interpretations of provincial policies could also inhibit service provision.

Progressive child welfare efforts require long-range planning and investment. Municipal officials, however, are often pressured to favour short-term solutions so that they can show results when they face the voters every two years. This tendency is further reinforced by the real limitations on property tax revenues. These inherent pressures in municipal politics might result in short-sighted planning in child welfare and an over-emphasis on saving costs which could affect the manner in which civic employees deliver services to children and families, for example by reducing the ability of the system to respond to individuals requiring preventive help rather than crisis intervention.

Municipal governments, like provincial ones, are dependent upon the goodwill of voters for their continued existence. This could discourage political support for any consumer or community involvement which might create an adversary situation. To avoid possible political embarrassment, a municipal child welfare system could prefer to rely on consultation of consumers and the community rather than soliciting their active involvement. This direction could inhibit accountability to both consumers and the community.

Experiences in other countries, particularly the United States, suggest that municipal administration of child welfare services is most successful in urban areas with developed expertise in child welfare and adequate community support and resources.

IV QUASI-PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Many of the comments in this section have been highlighted on previous pages. Readers are urged to consult Part One of the study for a complete overview of Children's Aid Society structure and relationships.

A. Description

Children's Aid Societies have been described at various times as "quasi-public", "quasi-private" and "voluntary" in nature. This study uses the term "quasi-public" to refer to the status of Societies as private corporations which are funded under the terms of law by public monies.

Quasi-public administration of child welfare is characterized by provincial government delegation of responsibility for the administration and delivery of services to private agencies, namely Children's Aid Societies. Delegation carries with it mandatory public funding for all functions required by The Child Welfare Act. The Province pays 80 percent of the costs and local governments contribute the remaining 20 percent.

As private corporations, Societies are required to have a membership which elects a Board of Directors to govern the affairs of each Society. By law, four elected municipal officials must sit on the Executive Committee of the Board. The Board is also required to hire a local director to manage the daily work of each Society.

Societies are responsible to the provincial Director of Child Welfare in their region for fulfilling the requirements of The Child Welfare Act. They are also accountable to the Province and local governments for the proper use of public funds.

With the establishment of local children's services committees, Societies would receive their funding through these committees and would be directly responsible to them for meeting assessed local needs within the framework of provincial legislation, standards and guidelines.

A fuller description of the mandate, structure and function of Societies can be found in Part One, Section II.

B. Example

It does not appear that any other country has a quasi-public child welfare system comparable in structure or authority to that in Ontario. In fact, Ontario remains the only Canadian province or territory in which Children's Aid Societies have total statutory responsibility for child welfare.

In Manitoba, five Societies have delegated authority for services to about 75 percent of the population while the provincial Department of Health and Social Development delivers services to the remainder. (42)

The province of Nova Scotia has 12 Societies which serve every part of the province with the exception of four counties where the provincial Department of Social Services has authority. A unique feature of the Nova Scotia system is that, in 10 of the 12 Societies, the local director is also a civil servant responsible for the provision of other Departmental programs within the jurisdiction. This arrangement strengthens Society accountability and facilitates coordination of all social services. The Department thus considers that this joint responsibility has much to commend it. (43)

Societies formerly enjoyed statutory authority in two other provinces: New Brunswick and British Columbia. However, in 1967, New Brunswick unified the services of Societies and municipal welfare departments under the provincial Department of Youth and Welfare. Similarly, British Columbia dissolved its three Societies between 1972 and 1973 and services eventually became the responsibility of the provincial Department of Human Resources.

C. Evaluation of Potential for Use in Ontario

1. Accountability

a) To funders:

Societies are required to report to and cooperate with the provincial government and must allow four elected municipal representatives to sit on the Executive Committee of their Boards. These provisions, dictated by The Child Welfare Act, are designed to enforce Society accountability to both government funders.

In practice, the levels of accountability have been varied across the province due to lack of standards and mutual understanding regarding roles and responsibilities. Accountability is more difficult to enforce due to the semi-autonomous nature of Societies than it is when services are delivered through a government department.

Society accountability to funders would be enhanced through the projected implementation and enforcement of Provincial standards and the establishment of local children's services committees with authority for allocation of funds. Accountability could also be strengthened through formal clarification of the relationships between Societies, the Province and local governments. For example, the role of local councillors on Society Boards could be defined. In addition, local Ministry staff could be encouraged to attend Society Board meetings on a regular basis to facilitate cooperation and understanding between Societies and the Ministry.

b) To the community:

Prior to public funding, Societies were required to approach the community on a regular basis for donations. These appeals made Societies visible in their communities and undoubtedly generated donations of voluntary time as well as money. Today, however, there is little necessity to make public appeals since funding is now guaranteed for basic statutory services.

As a result, the levels of community involvement demonstrated by Societies vary tremendously across the province as reflected in both membership and volunteer statistics. (See Appendix C for full survey results.)

Sixteen Societies report 0 to 10 volunteers while the median number of volunteers is 20.2 per Society. Numbers of volunteers range from 0 to 640 with almost 80 percent of the total number being found in large Societies. The 11 northern Societies surveyed reported only 90 volunteers among them or 4 percent of the total number. Not surprisingly, voluntarism seems healthiest in urban areas with the traditions, resources, expertise and concentration of population to support it.

Statistics on Society membership roughly parallel those on volunteers, again indicating a tremendous range in Society abilities to attract community involvement.

Societies could improve their accountability to the community by expanding volunteer programs, increasing membership, and ensuring broader representation of various community interests on Society Boards. Community advisory committees could also be established to ensure sensitivity and appropriateness of programs. Greater efforts could also be made to take the Society into the community through more visible public relations programs and greater involvement in community activities.

The potential for community accountability is excellent due to the variety of legitimate mechanisms for public involvement and support available to Societies as non-government bodies. However, possibilities are not presently realized by most Societies and the onus remains on them to demonstrate that they are capable of doing so.

c) To consumers:

Accountability to consumers can be measured by the degree to which Societies facilitate active consumer involvement in the planning, administration and evaluation of services. In general, Societies have failed to reflect accountability to consumers in their structure or functions.

This failure is illustrated by the fact that most Society Boards have no former or present consumers members. Excluding adoptive parents, consumers represent only 3.7 percent of Ontario-wide Board membership.

Also disturbing is the fact that consumers may file complaints with only 11 Society Boards. Almost 70 percent of Societies have no mechanism for consumer complaints to the Board. Thus, many Boards could be unaware of recurring problems and, as a result, develop policies inappropriate to consumer needs.

None of the Societies which the study group visited outside of Toronto were able to arrange a consultation with consumers. The fact that consumer involvement is not viewed as a priority was also apparent in a number of discussions with Society representatives which suggested that the "charity" orientation to service provision was still the prevailing philosophy among many Society policy-makers.

Consumer involvement can only occur with the adoption of a "service" orientation, e.g., that consumers of a service have a right to quality service and to recourse in the event of complaint. The involvement of consumers in the planning, administration and evaluation of services could help to ensure quality and appropriateness and would recognize their status as recipients of services as opposed to charity.

There is no inherent obstacle in Society structure or function which deters consumer involvement. Success, however, depends largely upon the priority accorded to it.

Accountability to consumers could be enhanced by increased representation of current and former consumers on Society Boards. Societies could also establish formal mechanisms for processing complaints and facilitating consumer access to the Board in the event of disagreement. Staff should also be obliged to clearly inform consumers of their right to file a complaint and their means to appeal to the Board and, if necessary, to the Ministry.

In addition, the establishment of consumer advisory committees and formalized evaluation techniques could help Societies plan and deliver services appropriate to the needs of consumers.

2. Advocacy Ability

The semi-autonomous nature of Societies could make their ability to advocate in the interests of children far superior to that of government departments. Again, however, Societies appear to have fallen far short of their potential in this area. For example, only eight Societies have a Board committee which deals with social issues. Nor is there much evidence of Societies taking consistent public stands on issues affecting their consumers.

These weaknesses may be due in part to the non-representativeness of most Society Boards and their subsequent lack of understanding of the social and economic factors impinging on the lives of many children and their families who require the services of Societies.

Lack of Board representativeness has, in some instances, led to conflicts between consumer interests and those of some current Board members. For example, the social issues committee of a large Society recently asked its Board to endorse the continuation of rent controls to facilitate the access of many consumers to affordable accommodation. The Board, however, declined to endorse the proposal. Regardless of the actual motivation for rejection of the proposal, it was interpreted by many as an attempt to protect the interests of some Board members at the expense of consumer needs. This type of situation might be avoided by broadened representation of interests on the Board and guidelines for procedure in the event of conflicts of interest.

OACAS, the provincial coordinating body for Societies, is theoretically in an excellent position to publicly promote the interests of children. However, a strong advocacy role for OACAS has been blunted by the wide variance in political philosophy found among its 51 member agencies. As a result, OACAS has become associated primarily with protecting Society self-interests rather than with advancing the interests of children.

Effective consumer advocacy could be enhanced by province-wide coordination by OACAS. However, to be successful, OACAS would be required to re-establish its credibility and viability. This could be initiated by a thorough evaluation and redirection of current OACAS priorities and programs to complement a coordinated, province-wide child welfare advocacy program.

A further deterrent to Society advocacy efforts is the fear expressed by some that taking public stands in opposition to government policies adversely affecting children might jeopardize their funding stability. This fear is totally without foundation, according to representatives of the few Societies which have engaged in successful advocacy. The latter group claims that not only does advocacy not threaten Society status, it actually enhances the credibility of Societies in the eyes of government, consumers and the community.

The advocacy ability of Societies could be strengthened by the establishment of social issues committees to monitor new developments affecting children and coordinate Society advocacy activities. The committee should be representative and open to staff, consumers and community representatives as well as Board members.

3. Coordination

Coordination with local services and among Societies is, again, varied in quality across the province. Societies are not required by law to relate to each other and many Society Board and staff members revealed little awareness of activities outside their jurisdiction.

On the local level, most coordination appears to occur informally through the initiative of front-line staff and without clear direction or support from the Board or senior staff.

In general, the independent nature of Societies appears to inhibit effective coordination on both a provincial and local basis.

4. Effectiveness

Given the necessary resources, Societies have the potential to deliver services at and beyond the minimum required level. The quasi-public status of Societies creates freedom to strive for and achieve excellence. Unfortunately, it can also encourage complacency. As a result, there is a tremendous range between the strongest and weakest Societies in the province.

The fact that a potential for excellence exists suggests that action is possible to upgrade the weaker Societies and reinforce the strengths of others. For example, an accreditation system could be developed to measure and recognize performance above the minimum. Provincial resources could be allocated to facilitate an extensive program of information-sharing and training among Societies at both the Board and staff levels.

Finally, the quasi-public status of Societies enables them, unlike government departments, to seek funding from other public and private sources. Greater direction of Board efforts in this area could generate funds for special projects or allow upgrading of existing programs.

5. Availability

General availability of basic services is required by law and would be ensured by standards.

6. Flexibility

The ability of Societies to respond to varying and differing needs in a flexible manner is varied and depends largely on local values, expertise and resources. Thus, Societies can be either highly flexible or extremely rigid in their interpretation of needs and subsequent program delivery.

Flexibility could be enhanced through greater community involvement which would facilitate understanding of the variety of different needs within the community.

D. Effects of Local Children's Services Committees

The establishment of local children's services committees could strengthen the efforts of Societies in a number of areas although the full extent of local committee authority over statutory services is not yet clear.

Local committees could provide Societies with a further mechanism for accountability directly within their communities. Funds would be allocated on the basis of assessed local needs which could help Societies to provide services most appropriate for their communities.

Local committees could also promote coordination and communication among local agencies, thus reducing the tendency of Societies to remain apart from the community. Improved coordination could reduce duplication of services thereby encouraging new program development to meet identified needs.

Some Societies have expressed general support of the concept of local children's services committees, noting the needs for improved coordination and maximized use of available resources. Others, however, express serious reservations about the ability of municipal officials to promote enlightened services for children, given existing strains on the limited property tax bases of local governments.

In many areas, Societies and local governments are currently playing major roles in planning local children's services committees for their communities. This process could provide an excellent opportunity for both parties to negotiate the terms of their future relationship, put aside self-interests and work together in the interests of children.

E. Political Implications

Given that a quasi-public child welfare system presently exists in Ontario, this section will focus both on the political implications of its continued existence and on those of its dissolution.

It would be unrealistic to expect that any child welfare system could eliminate the inherent risks in delivering services to troubled children and their families. The present delegation of responsibility for child welfare to Societies, however, does have the political advantage of providing the Minister with a buffer when the inevitable crises arise. Direct responsibility for mistakes now lies with Societies, not with the Government as it would in

a provincially administered system. The creation of local children's services committees responsible to local government would also strengthen this advantage by clearly directing problems to the local level for resolution.

A decision to revoke the authority of Societies could have serious implications for the planned decentralization of children's services coordination through local children's services committees. The initiation of this process has already required a major reorientation of existing services. To introduce a new child welfare system during this transition could possibly jeopardize the whole experiment.

Societies which consistently fail to meet stated expectations are justifiable cause for political concern. A government takeover of Society functions might succeed in eliminating some of the identified weaknesses in the structure and relationships of the existing system. These weaknesses, however, are not found in every Society. Some Societies are firmly rooted in their communities and have demonstrated abilities to innovate and respond to changing needs. Dissolution of Societies would eliminate not only the weaknesses but also the strengths of the system.

The present child welfare system has been criticized by some for its lack of accountability to elected bodies. The Province, however, does retain the power through legislation to enforce basic standards and monitor the performance of Societies. This offers the public a final avenue of appeal to the Province in the event of unresolved complaints about Society services. This advantage would be lost if the Province itself assumed responsibility for child welfare services and had a vested interest in protecting itself from criticism about the services which it delivered.

A final comment ought to be made regarding the impact of Society retention or abolition on voluntary participation in child welfare. Society volunteers presently donate an invaluable number of hours to child welfare efforts which some observers feel would be lost if services were delivered by government departments. It has been demonstrated, however, that significant numbers of Societies have failed to generate extensive volunteer involvement. This perhaps suggests that leadership, staffing and funding of support to volunteers is more important than the type of structure in determining successful volunteer participation.

Dissolution of Societies in communities with limited voluntary traditions would not likely meet with extensive political resistance from the community. However, in areas with strong voluntary commitments to local Societies, a government takeover of child welfare services could meet with great opposition from volunteers and their organizations.

Thus, any projected change in the structure of the child welfare system should be preceded by extensive community consultation and negotiation.

V CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION

A. Description

Current policy suggests that local children's services committees would be coordinating and allocative bodies with no responsibility for direct service delivery. It is possible, however, that some local committees could emerge as the most appropriate bodies to deliver services, particularly in parts of Ontario which have no municipal organization, or extensive children's services network and have populations spread over large geographical areas.

For this reason, the study group chose to assess the potential of local children's services committee administration as a possible option for the delivery of child welfare services in non-urban areas. It is assumed that this option would not be viable in urban areas with extensive and complex children's services networks and that local committees in these communities would remain responsible only for coordination and allocation of funds.

Implementation of this model would require that the authority for child welfare presently delegated to Children's Aid Societies be vested in local children's services committees in selected areas. Local committees would then become directly responsible for service delivery. Depending upon local needs, child welfare services could be provided directly by staff hired by local committees or other agencies could be contracted to perform specific functions.

B. Example

The province of Quebec has been pursuing a program of regional coordination and local integration of all health and social services since 1971. Between 1973 and 1977, the province of British Columbia also experimented with a program of integration and decentralization of social service delivery. These provincial experiences, however, differ markedly from the projected direction in Ontario. For example, neither Quebec nor British Columbia established local committees responsible solely for children's services. In addition, neither province devolved responsibility for services to local governments.

It is possible, however, to draw some ideas from the British Columbia experiment which suggest how local children's services committees might operate with added responsibility for delivery of statutory child welfare services.

In late 1973, the provincial government in British Columbia introduced a plan to integrate social services and decentralize their delivery. In Vancouver, the two Children's Aid Societies and the municipal welfare department were dissolved. The Vancouver Resources Board (VRB) was subsequently created and given responsibility in the Vancouver area for the overall administration and delivery of all statutory social services including child welfare. The VRB was also responsible for the coordination and allocation of funding to the 14 local community resources boards established in the Vancouver area. (44)

Each local board was made up of 10 residents chosen by their communities in public elections governed by statute and funded by the provincial government. Elected members were reimbursed only for expenses. One member of each local board served on the VRB along with two city councillors, two Provincial appointees and one representative each from the School and Parks Board.

Child welfare and other statutory social services were decentralized into the local board areas and delivered by social service teams salaried by the VRB and coordinated by local boards. Local boards also had the authority to administer grants to voluntary groups providing non-statutory services in their areas.

The experiment was viewed with mistrust by many municipal officials who felt the authority of the VRB could more properly be vested in local government. (45) The resources boards became an issue in the 1975 provincial election. The new provincial government subsequently revoked the authority of the VRB in 1978 and vested responsibility for the delivery of statutory social services in the provincial Department of Human Resources.

The experience in British Columbia illustrates how the VRB, a coordinating and allocative body like the projected local children's services committees in Ontario, also assumed responsibility for the delivery of statutory services. This type of model could be considered for implementation in some parts of Ontario. For example, child welfare services in northern Ontario, particularly in those areas with no municipal organization, could be delivered through locally elected children's services committees responsible to a regional children's services committee or the regional Ministry office. It is this type of structure which will be considered on the following pages.

C. Evaluation of Potential for Use in Ontario

Detailed assessment of this model based on the desired characteristics is not useful for several reasons. First, the projected mandate of local children's services committees includes a commitment to encourage the development of these characteristics, both internally and among other children's services providers. Given that local committees are not yet functional across the province, it would be premature to assess their ability to do so.

Second, if some local committees were also given responsibility for delivering child welfare services, as projected in the model under consideration, they would be free to contract out functions to whatever bodies were assessed most capable. If delegate bodies failed to reflect desired characteristics in their provision of services, the local committee could require improvement as a condition of contract extension and funding. Local committees could also choose to hire their own staff to deliver services. Given the range of choices available to local committees in providing services, it is assumed that they would attempt to ensure that services reflected a progressive philosophy in their structure and relationships.

For these reasons, the following comments are designed to identify in general rather than specific terms the possible strengths and weaknesses of local children's services committee administration of child welfare services.

It is anticipated that all local children's services committees would be broadly representative of their communities. The public election of local committee members could strengthen all aspects of accountability and encourage community interest and involvement in children's services, particularly in areas with no significant number of service or community organizations and few mechanisms for participation. The resources board elections in B.C. succeeded in attracting community interest and participation far beyond previous levels. (46) Children's services committee elections might therefore help to secure a meaningful community mandate for services in parts of Ontario where community participation has been discouraged by geographical distances and conditions.

As noted, local committees with responsibility for child welfare service delivery could choose to deliver services directly or to delegate certain functions to other agencies through purchase of service agreements or contracts. This system would have the advantage of allowing the local committee to contract out functions to the most capable agency. This could improve the quality of services by allowing agencies to concentrate on what they could do best. For example, the local committee might choose to relieve the local Society of its current protection function in order to allow it to develop fully as a community support service for children and families in distress. Families or children requiring in-depth or long-term therapeutic help or legal intervention could then be referred elsewhere.

The system, as illustrated, would allow division of the various child welfare functions presently delegated to Societies. It is not clear, however, whether this would ultimately be a strength or weakness of the system. Some observers fear that a separation of functions could cause a disruption in services to families who require a continuum of service. Others feel that the separation of functions, particularly prevention and protection, could improve services by no longer requiring child welfare staff to function simultaneously as "helpers" and "accusers". The local committee, however, would be able to assess the implications of such a division within its community and, on that basis, then choose either to combine or separate the functions. This type of flexibility based on local needs may be perceived as a strength of this model.

If a local committee decided that the functions of child welfare should remain combined, it could choose either to contract out the entire mandate or to assume direct responsibility for it itself. Direct delivery of child welfare services by local committees could alleviate problems of coordination, duplication or gaps in service, and accessibility often faced by consumers and service deliverers in remote or rural communities. In such areas, it is even possible that all children's services could be most appropriately administered by local committees.

While this model offers several exciting possibilities for enhancing the quality of services and allowing local innovation and flexibility, it also has several areas of potential weakness.

One area for concern could be the relationship between local committees and the local and provincial political systems. Decisions regarding methods and focus of service delivery should be based upon the needs of children and their families and not on the self-interests of governments, institutions or agencies. Safeguards would be necessary to ensure that local committees remain free enough from political pressures to administer services in the best interests of consumers.

A further issue to be considered is the possibility of fragmentation of services across the province. With the advent of local committees, each community would, in theory, have the option of deciding how and by whom child welfare services would be delivered. This could mean that many variations would exist across the province. To then subdivide the mandate among various bodies at the local level could create further fragmentation and inconsistency across the province making coordination, monitoring and evaluation extremely difficult beyond the local area.

A final concern regarding transfer of service delivery responsibilities to local committees involves a possible reduction in their abilities beyond provision of service. It is possible, for example, that the pressure of daily demands for service could diminish the freedom of local committees to promote coordination of functions and engage in advocacy activities. A reduction in these activities could in turn affect the effectiveness and appropriateness of services. For this reason, direct service delivery responsibility appears suitable only for those local committees in areas with few existing services or complex bureaucracies.

As local bodies, local children's services committees would vary in quality from area to area depending upon local values, resources and expertise. Even public election of members could not always guarantee a consistently progressive approach to child welfare or other children's services. Therefore, prior to transfer of the child welfare mandate from Societies to local committees, careful assessment would be necessary to ensure that problems of a particular locality were not simply being transferred from one body to another.

D. Political Implications

The delegation of service delivery responsibility to local committees would make services directly accountable at the local level. This would occur regardless of whether committees were locally elected or appointed bodies responsible to local councils. Even if local committees were responsible to Ministry offices in areas without municipal organizations, public attention or criticism would remain primarily at the local level.

Any possible political advantages of this model appear outweighed by the fact that the future capabilities of local children's services committees are not yet known. It is clearly not a viable model for the entire province. It appears, however, to warrant further consideration for specific areas and could be reassessed at a later time when the potential of local committees has been more fully demonstrated.

VI SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

Ontario is a province with a tremendous range of regional, cultural, economic, social and individual needs within its boundaries. An appropriate child welfare system for Ontario is one which could both recognize and respond to these differences while also ensuring that services are equitable and comprehensive across the province.

Each model presented for assessment exhibits strengths in particular features and weaknesses in others. There is no perfect system and, unfortunately, not even the most brilliant planners, administrators and deliverers could protect every child from physical and emotional harm. That reality however should not prevent pursuit of the ideal.

A summary of the potential strengths and weaknesses of each option assessed in the study is presented on the following pages. It should be noted that strengths in one area often result in weaknesses in another. The identification of priorities is therefore essential and must, in the end, be balanced against political realities which will ultimately be the decisive factor in any government action regarding child welfare.

Summary Assessment of Future Options

Model	Potential Strengths	Potential Weaknesses
I <u>Provincial Administration</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - excellent direct accountability to funder - standardization; services less influenced by negative local values - more uniformity in reporting, monitoring and evaluation - resources for staff training and upgrading - central coordination could facilitate mobility and sharing of expertise - most suitable in small and/or homogeneous areas where uniform, standardized practices are appropriate or where local resources are adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - centralized decision-making could weaken community and consumer accountability - central control deters community and consumer involvement - proximity to political system could make system overly responsive to political pressures rather than service needs - might lead to more apprehension of children and less responsible risk-taking and preventive work - central control might lead to rigidity and inability to respond to differing local needs - increased standardization may preclude excellence - poor advocacy ability - ability to provide services beyond the required minimum limited by provincial financial priorities - coordination with local children's services committees would pose difficulties - interrupts spectrum of children's services to be coordinated at local level

Model	Potential Strengths	Potential Weaknesses
II <u>Municipal Administration</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - could enable flexible response to local needs; more innovation - excellent accountability to local funder - close to sources of need; allows quick consultation and response - community-base facilitates community involvement - most suitable in areas with developed expertise, community support and resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - subject to variation in quality depending upon local values, expertise and resources - reduced local advocacy ability due to proximity to political structure - long-term planning inhibited by short-term perspective of municipal politics - emphasis on cost-saving might deter preventive work - no tradition of consumer or significant community involvement in welfare services - poor province-wide coordination and evaluation due to varying practices, procedures and priorities - financial resources unlikely to allow development of services beyond the required minimum - potential conflict between conservative and liberal interpretations of provincial policies - no traditional expertise in child welfare

Model	Potential Strengths	Potential Weaknesses
III <u>Quasi-Public Administration</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- demonstrated expertise in child welfare- independence and specialization make advocacy potential high- free from direct political interference; ability to focus on children as first concern- enables broad community representation on Board of Directors- allows community participation through membership and volunteer programs- free to raise money beyond statutory public allocations; facilitates service development beyond required minimum- most suitable in urban areas with developed expertise, community support and resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- subject to variation in quality depending upon local values, expertise and resources- local autonomy inhibits provincial coordination- flexibility of structure subject to abuse particularly in areas with no strong community commitment- independence from political structure creates problems of accountability- financial independence creates tendency toward isolation from community

Model	Potential Strengths	Potential Weaknesses
IV <u>Children's Services Committee Administration</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - option to delegate functions based on assessed ability of agencies - advocacy ability good but generalized to all children's services - flexibility to allow response to local needs - good potential for community and consumer involvement due to local base - good coordination with other children's services as body responsible for allocating funds - most suitable in areas with few existing services and bureaucracies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - subject to variations in local values, resources and expertise - pressure of service delivery could diminish coordinating and advocacy abilities - no demonstrated ability - child welfare might lose priority to other children's services - varying local practices could lead to fragmentation of services on province-wide basis

CONCLUSION

The intent of this study was to provide a framework for the discussion, debate and ultimate resolution of concerns regarding the structure and relationships of child welfare services. Current concerns were balanced with information gained from a survey of and visits to Children's Aid Societies and in consultations with major constituencies. Finally, four structural options for the administration of child welfare services were assessed.

All of the studies to date regarding child welfare and Children's Aid Societies have concluded with a series of recommendations for policy and action. Yet, as this study revealed, most of the issues and concerns expressed 10 years ago remain unresolved to this day. As a result, public confidence in Societies appears to be waning and many members and staff of Societies are confused, frustrated and demoralized about their role. In the interests of the children and their families who become by default the victims of the uncertainty and controversy surrounding the Children's Aid Societies, we would hope that this study will be the last in the series. Clearly, no amount of study can take the place of definitive action and leadership to end the years of controversy and unresolved debate.

A number of developments have occurred since the initiation of this study which have implications for child welfare services. For example, four local children's services committees have been approved by the Minister to serve as demonstration projects prior to province-wide introduction. Most recently, the Ministry announced a major program to review the operations of every Children's Aid Society over the next five years. The intent of these initiatives, however, remains unclear. Is it to be assumed, for example, that they are an attempt to strengthen the ability of the Societies to fulfill their mandate? Or, are they simply a preliminary step to transfer of responsibility to another body? Given the noted confusion and apprehension which already exists, it seems imperative that the Ministry issue a formal statement clarifying its long-term commitments.

Resolution of the issues addressed in this study is both necessary and overdue. We believe, however, that it would be erroneous to conclude that a simple transfer of authority for child welfare services delivery would miraculously solve all of the problems which place children in situations of risk. Each of the structural options assessed in this study could potentially strengthen specific aspects of the service system. In balance, however, none possesses inherent characteristics which would automatically create a superior child welfare system. Ultimately, the test of any system will be in the scope and foresight of its philosophy, the capabilities and cooperation of its government and community leaders, the quality of its management and staff, and the adequacy of its resources.

The study group offers its full cooperation and support in the public consultations following publication of this document. We anticipate that most individuals and organizations concerned about the welfare of children will join us in urging the provincial government to end the consultation process with a clear statement of policy regarding the future of Children's Aid Societies and a detailed plan of action to support the development of a child welfare system capable of meeting the challenges of the future.

REFERENCES

1. For more detail, see Children's Services Division Consultation Paper, Local Children's Services Committees: Planning for the Future.
2. Many ideas were drawn from Basic Principles of Service Delivery (Children's Services Division Newsletter, August 1977); Report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Child Welfare; and Joseph C. Ryant and others, A Review of Child Welfare Policies, Programs and Services in Manitoba.
3. R. B. Splane, Social Welfare in Ontario, 1791-1893, p. 220.
4. Neil Sutherland, Children in English Canadian Society: Framing the 20th Century Consensus, p. 18.
5. Russell Jolliffe, "The History of the Children's Aid Society of Toronto, 1891-1947" (unpublished Master's thesis, School of Social Work, University of Toronto, 1952), p. 26.
6. Ibid., p. 23.
7. Ibid., p. 40.
8. Ibid., (first draft), pp. 27-28.
9. Ibid., pp. 52-62.
10. Ibid., (first draft), p. 32.
11. Calculations are based on budget reports from the Ministry and in OACAS Surveys.
12. Children's Services Division, Local Children's Services Committees: Planning for the Future.
13. See Appendix B for breakdown.
14. OACAS Surveys 1978, p. i.
15. OACAS, A Working Manual for Board Members of Children's Aid Societies, p. 27.
16. The Child Welfare Act, 1978 (Bill 114), Section 2 (2).
17. OACAS Surveys 1978, pp. 41-4.
18. OACAS, "Position Paper" re Urwick, Currie & Partners Ltd., Managerial Report No. 1, p. 7.

19. OACAS, "Statement to the Minister of Community and Social Services Regarding the Hanson Task Force Report on Child Welfare", p. 1.
20. Ontario Municipal Association and Ontario Welfare Officers' Association, "Brief to the Minister's Advisory Committee on Child Welfare".
21. This recommendation came from the Legislative and Resolutions Committee of AMO during its annual conference, August 1975.
22. "The Future of Children's Aid Societies - Improving the Present Structure", a discussion paper prepared by a number of municipal social service personnel, November 1975.
23. Ibid., also reaffirmed in the Ontario Municipal Social Services Association, "Submission to the Joint Provincial/Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies Funding Issues Task Force", September 1978.
24. OACAS, "Brief to the Task Force on Community and Social Services", p. 17.
25. OACAS Press Release, August 24, 1971.
26. Editorials in the Globe and Mail dated September 13 and 24 and October 9, 1968; September 18, 1969; August 24, 1971; August 18 and 30, 1973; December 15 and 23, 1977; January 21, February 2 and 20, March 6, 22 and 29, June 23, August 31, September 14 and 28, 1978.
27. Editorials in the Toronto Star dated September 13, 1968; December 18, 1973; March 13, August 3, 1974; September 15, 1975; February 19, March 2 and 13, 1976; September 14 and 19, October 15, 1977; March 28, June 27, August 25 and October 23, 1978.
28. Editorial in The Citizen, March 31, 1978.
29. Editorial in The Kitchener-Waterloo Record, February 19, 1976.
30. Editorials in the Free Press dated November 12, 1976; April 21 and December 19, 1977; February 28, 1978.
31. Editorials in the Sault Star dated July 27, October 5, 1976; May 30, 1978.
32. Editorial in The Spectator, May 14, 1971.
33. Editorial in The Windsor Star, March 3, 1976.
34. Task Force on Community and Social Services, Reported on Selected Issues and Relationships, p. 61.

35. Ibid., p. 54.
36. See Basic Principles of Service Delivery (Children's Services Newsletter), Report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Child Welfare and Joseph C. Ryant and others, A Review of Child Welfare Policies, Programs and Practices in Manitoba.
37. Letter from Ken Schnell, Planning and Special Projects, Child Welfare Branch, Alberta Department of Social Services and Community Health, July 11, 1978.
38. See Appendix D.
39. Interview with James Meyer, Coordinator of Children in Care, P.E.I. Department of Social Services, October 16, 1978.
40. See Appendix D.
41. Alfred J. Kahn and Sheila B. Kamerman, Cross-National Studies of Social Service Systems - United Kingdom Reports; also D. Thomson, "Seebohm and After: Some Observations and Comments on Reorganization of the British Social Services Since 1970".
42. Joseph C. Ryant, p. 17.
43. Letter from W. D. Greator, Director, Special Protection Services, Nova Scotia Department of Social Services, June 1, 1978.
44. Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, Background Report: "In Search of a Framework", p. 77.
45. Ibid., and the Institute for Public Administration of Canada, Toronto Group, Coordinating Human Services in Metropolitan Toronto, Section VI, p. 15.
46. Ibid., p. 14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barber, Charles and Patricia Canning, Community Resources Boards: The Possibilities (second draft). Victoria, B.C.: Alcohol and Drug Commission, November 20, 1973.

Bellamy, Donald F., "Historical Development of Social Welfare in Canada", a manuscript submitted to the Social Work Encyclopedia. School of Social Work, University of Toronto, July 1963.

Blyth, Jack A., The Canadian Social Inheritance. Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1972.

Boyle, Michael, "To Whom is the Children's Aid Accountable", Journal (January 1972) pp. 1-5, Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies.

Brilliant, Eleanor L., "Private or Public: A Model of Ambiguities", Social Service Review, September 1973.

British Columbia. Ministry of Human Resources, Towards a Family and Youth Service System, a report prepared for the Minister, May 1973.

Bury, W. H., Development Aspects of Child Welfare Legislation in Ontario. Ontario: Department of Social and Family Services, 1959.

Canada. Department of Health, Handbook of Child Welfare Work in Canada. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, 1923.

Canada. Department of National Health and Welfare, Changes and Developments in Child Welfare Services in Canada, 1949-1953. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, September 1954.

Canada. Department of National Health and Welfare, Changes in Child Welfare Legislation in Canada, 1958, 1959, 1960 and 1961. Ottawa, January 1962.

Canada. Department of National Health and Welfare, Changes in Child Welfare Legislation in Canada, 1962 and 1963. Ottawa, January 1965.

Canada. Department of National Health and Welfare, Child Welfare in Canada, Memorandum 15, April 1959.

Canadian Welfare Council, Public-Private Relationships in Child Welfare: Report of the Study. Ottawa, 1950.

Child Welfare League of America, Guide for Board Organization in Social Agencies. New York, 1975.

Child Welfare League of America, A National Program for Comprehensive Child Welfare Services. New York, 1971.

Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto, "History of the Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto", Our Children, Spring 1975.

Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto, Summary of Activities 1875-1975. Toronto, 1975.

Dearin, William D., "Raising Private Income for Children's Services". Child Welfare League of America, April 12, 1978.

Hepworth, Philip H., Personal Social Services in Canada: Access and Delivery. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, April 1975.

Hoshino, George, "Social Services: The Problem of Accountability", The Social Services Review, Vol. 47, No. 2, June 1973.

Jolliffe, Russell "The History of the Children's Aid Society of Toronto, 1891-1947". Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toronto School of Social Work, April 1952.

Kahn, A. J. and S. B. Kamerman (eds), Cross National Studies of Social Service Systems (United Kingdom, French, Federal Republic of Germany, Israeli, Polish and Yugoslav Reports). New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1976.

Lippincott, Earle and Elling Aannestad, "Management of Voluntary Welfare Agencies", Harvard Business Review, November-December 1964.

Mayo, H. B., Report of the Ottawa-Carleton Review Commission. Ontario: Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, October 1976.

McGuigan, Lorne, Report on a Study of Social Services to Children submitted to the Government of New Brunswick, September 1975.

Ontario. Department of Public Welfare, Report of the Advisory Committee on Child Welfare to the Minister of Public Welfare, 1964.

Ontario. Department of Social and Family Services, Report on Adoption and Foster Care. Toronto, June 1970.

Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Children's Services Division, Children's Services (newsletter), August 1977, November 1977, January 1978, June 1978, October 1978.

Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Children's Services Division, Consultation Paper on Short Term Legislative Amendments, December 1977.

Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Children's Services Division, Local Children's Services Committees: Planning for the Future, January 1978.

Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Children's Services Division, Program Priorities for Children's Services in 1978, April 1978.

Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Task Force on Community and Social Services, Report on Selected Issues and Relationships, January 1974.

Ontario. The Child Welfare Act, 1978 (Bill 114), Toronto: The Queen's Printer, 1978.

Ontario. The Corporations Act (RSO 1970, Chapter 89) Toronto: The Queen's Printer, September 1977.

Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, Brief to the Task Force on Community and Social Services, April 18, 1973.

Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, OACAS Surveys, (1959-64, 1969-78).

Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, "Position Paper" re Urwick, Currie & Partners, Ltd. Managerial Report No. 1, November 1970.

Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, "Report of the Policy Committee to the Directors" re a desirable child welfare program for Ontario and possible structural options, February 1960.

Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, "Response to Welfare Officers' Association Demand for a Takeover of Children's Aid Societies", a press release dated August 24, 1971.

Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, "Statement to the Ministry of Community and Social Services regarding the Hanson Task Force Report on Child Welfare", February 28, 1974.

Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, A Working Manual for Board Members of Children's Aid Societies. Toronto, 1977.

Ontario Municipal Association and Ontario Welfare Officers' Association, "Brief to the Minister's Advisory Committee on Child Welfare", 1964.

Ontario Municipal Social Services Association, "Submission to the Joint Provincial/Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies Funding Issues Task Force", September 1978.

Overdijk, T. van, "Building the Board - Election, Not Selection", Journal (May 1974) pp. 5-7. Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies.

Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. and the Child Welfare League of America, Child Welfare in 25 States, a report of the survey, 1976.

Pifer, Alan, "The Non-Governmental Organization at Bay", 1966 Annual Report, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Pifer, Alan, "The Jeopardy of Private Institutions", 1970 Annual Report, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Robarts, John, Report of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto. Ontario: Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, September 1977.

Ryant, Joseph C. and others, A Review of Child Welfare Policies, Programs and Services in Manitoba. Manitoba: Ministry of Health and Social Development, July 1975.

Spettigue, C. Owen, A Historical Review of Ontario Legislation on Child Welfare. Ontario: Department of Public Welfare, 1956.

Splane, R. B., Social Welfare in Ontario, 1791-1893. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, Background Report: In Search of a Framework, January 1976.

The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto and the Institute for Public Administration of Canada, Toronto Group, Coordinating Human Services in Metropolitan Toronto, October 1976.

Sutherland, Neil, Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the 20th Century Consensus. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

"The Future of Children's Aid Societies - Improving the Present Structure", a discussion paper by a number of municipal officials, November 26, 1975.

Thomson, D., "Seebomh and After: Some Observations and Comments on Reorganization of British Social Services Since 1970". Family Service Centres of Greater Vancouver, 1973.

United States. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Children's Bureau, Organization for Child Welfare Services: A Statement on State Administered and State Supervised Child Welfare Programs. Washington, 1962.

Urwick, Currie & Partners Ltd., Study of the Managerial Effectiveness of Children's Aid Societies in ontario. Toronto, June 1969.

Wagner, Marsden and Mary Wagner, The Danish National Child-Care System: A Successful System as Model for the Reconstruction of American Child Care. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, Inc., 1976.

Wohlgemuth, Helen, "Public Welfare's Untapped Resource: The Advisory Committee as Advocate", Child Welfare, Vol. 48, No. 8, October 1969.

ONTARIO CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETIES

<u>County</u>	<u>Society</u>	<u>Local Director</u>	<u>President</u>
Algoma	Children's Aid Society of Sault Ste. Marie & District of Algoma 65 Willow Avenue Sault Ste. Marie P6B 5B1	Ron Luciano	R. N. McQuarrie
Brant	The Children's Aid Society of Brant Box 774 Brantford N3T 5R7	T.W.A. Van Overdijk	F. J. Ackers
Bruce	The Children's Aid Society of the County of Bruce Inc. Box 279 Walkerton N0G 2V0	Mrs. B. I. James	Doris Milne
Dufferin	The Children's Aid Society of the County of Dufferin Court House 51 Zina Street Orangeville L9W 1E5	Stephen Chandler	Weston B. Jacobs
Durham	Family & Children's Services of the Durham Region Box 321, Midtown Mall Oshawa L1H 7L3	Barnard Lewis	Vernon Asselstine
Elgin	The Children's Aid Society of the City of St. Thomas & the County of Elgin 27 Southwick Street St. Thomas N5R 3R7	Sylvio Mainville	Beth Charlton
Essex	The Children's Aid Society of the County of Essex 690 Cataraqui Street Windsor N9A 3P1	Jack Bevan	Richard C. Gates
Essex R.C.	The Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society for the County of Essex 1700 Assumption Street Windsor N9Y 4S2	Lorraine Tuite	Fr. Thomas J. Lever

Note: Names of Local Directors and Presidents are listed as in January, 1979.

ONTARIO CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETIES

<u>County</u>	<u>Society</u>	<u>Local Director</u>	<u>President</u>
Frontenac	The Children's Aid Society of the City of Kingston & the County of Frontenac Box 357 Kingston K7L 4W2	D. A. Judd	Dr. P. W. Rogers
Grey	The Children's Aid Society of Owen Sound and the County of Grey Box 129 Owen Sound N4K 5P9	Don Thompson	Alan Whitten
Haldimand	The Family & Children's Services of the County of Haldimand Box 909 Dunnville N1A 1T8	John L. MacGregor	Dr. A. A. Lyons
Halton	The Children's Aid Society of the County of Halton 1160 Blair Road, 2nd Flr. Burlington L7M 1K9	Ron Coupland	William Barclay
Hamilton	The Children's Aid Society of Hamilton-Wentworth 143 Wentworth Street South Hamilton L8N 2Z1	Jack Finlay	Joseph R. Sams
Hamilton R.C.	The Catholic Children's Aid Society of Hamilton- Wentworth 627 Main Street East Suite 3 Hamilton L8M 1J5	Miss G. Gibbons	Dr. W. Ross Barlow
Hastings	The Family & Children's Services of Hastings County, Box 186 Belleville K8N 5A2	Andre Bergon	J. Norman Rickaby
Huron	The Children's Aid Society of Huron County Box 218 Goderich N7A 1W7	John V. Penn	Charles Thomas

ONTARIO CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETIES

<u>County</u>	<u>Society</u>	<u>Local Director</u>	<u>President</u>
Kapuskasing	North Cochrane District Family Services Box 188 Kapuskasing P5N 2Y3	Jacques Martel	Ronald Pulsifer
Kawartha	Kawartha-Haliburton Children's Aid Society 570 Water Street Peterborough K9H 3M8	George Dove	William Carruthers
Kenora	Family & Children's Services of the District of Kenora, R.R. #1 Ocean Avenue Kenora P9N 3W7	Garry Norris	John Parry
Kent	The Children's Aid Society of the County of Kent Box 157 Chatham N7M 5K3	R. L. Whittington	Mitchel Miletic
Lambton	The Children's Aid Society of the City of Sarnia & the County of Lambton Box 41 Sarnia N7T 7H8	R. A. Mullin	J. McPhedran
Lanark	The Children's Aid Society of the County of Lanark & the Town of Smith Falls 33 Craig Street Perth K7H 1X8	Stephen Heder	Marion Sinn
Leeds	Family & Children's Services of Brockville & the United Counties of Leeds & Grenville Box 549 Brockville K6V 5V7	R. S. Fenemore	Dr. J. Arnott
Lennox	Family & Children's Services 41 Dundas St. West Napanea K0K 2R0	Malcolm McFarlane	Clarence Hegadorn

ONTARIO CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETIES

<u>County</u>	<u>Society</u>	<u>Local Director</u>	<u>President</u>
London	Family & Children's Services of London & Middlesex Box 848 London N6A 4Z5	M. T. O'Brien	Elaine H. Haharty
Muskoka	Muskoka Family & Children's Services Box 1107 Bracebridge P0B 1C0	Mary Tanton	Larry Archibald
Niagara	Family & Children's Services of the Niagara Region Box 516 St. Catharines L2R 6W5	John C. Elliott	Carol A. Verge
Nipissing	Family & Children's Services of the District of Nipissing 240 Algonquin Avenue North Bay P1B 4V9	Philip L. Blunt	A. Hutter
Norfolk	Family & Children's Services of Norfolk County, Box 601 Simcoe N3Y 4M1	A. M. de Swaff	Douglas Tiffin
Northumberland	Family & Children's Services of Northumberland 230 Walton Street Port Hope L1A 1P2	Douglas A. Nutter	Ron Good
Ottawa	The Children's Aid Society of Ottawa 1370 Bank Street Ottawa K1H 7Y3	Joseph A. Messner	Trent Gow
Oxford	Family & Children's Services of Oxford County Box 312 Woodstock N4S 7X6	Jeanne Deans	Cliff Robinson
Parry Sound	The Children's Aid Society of Parry Sound 76 Church Street Parry Sound P2A 1Z1	Donald Blacklock	Alex Macdonald

ONTARIO CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETIES

<u>County</u>	<u>Society</u>	<u>Local Director</u>	<u>President</u>
Peel	The Children's Aid Society of the Region of Peel 49 Kennedy Road South Brampton L6W 3E4	Paul Mansfield	F. R. Dalzell
Perth	The Children's Aid Society of the County of Perth Box 278 Stratford N5A 6T1	Clifford Taylor	Joan Parson
Porcupine	Porcupine & District Children's Aid Society 54 Algonquin Blvd. E. Timmins P4N 1A2	George Leck	Jackie Jonescu
Prescott	Prescott-Russell Children's Aid Society Box 248 Platagenet K0B 1L0	Pierre Lalonde	Yvon Huppe
Prince Edward	Children's Aid Society of the County of Prince Edward Box 1510 Picton K0K 2T0	Garth Smith	Maureen Finnegan
Rainy River	The Children's Aid Society of the District of Rainy River 512 Central Avenue Fort Frances P9A 1X9	Ronald W. King	George Mitchell
Renfrew	Family & Children's Services of Renfrew County 1219 Pembroke St. E. Pembroke K8A 7R8	Raymond Gray	Carl Fletcher
Simcoe	The Children's Aid Society of the County of Simcoe County Admin. Centre Midhurst L0L 1X0	T. D. Jackson	Jean Gradwell
Stormont	The Children's Aid Society of the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry, Box 994 Cornwall K6H 5V1	Thomas J. O'Brien	Tatiana Labekovski

ONTARIO CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETIES

<u>County</u>	<u>Society</u>	<u>Local Director</u>	<u>President</u>
Sudbury	The Children's Aid Society of the Districts of Sudbury & Manitoulin 1492 Paris Street Sudbury P3E 3B8	Walter J. Halinski	Robert Fabbro
Timiskaming	Family & Children's Services for the District of Timiskaming Box 1084 Kirkland Lake P2N 3L1	John Hayes	Barbara Martin
Thunder Bay	The Children's Aid Society of the District of Thunder Bay Box 27, Station "P" Thunder Bay P7B 5E7	Harry Lang	J. F. McCartney
Toronto	The Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto 33 Charles Street East Toronto M4Y 1R9	Doug Barr	Peter Tuck
Toronto R.C.	Catholic Children's Aid Society of Metro Toronto 26 Maitland Street Toronto M4Y 1C6	Ron Arellano	William F. Robinson
Waterloo	Family & Children's Services of the Waterloo Region, 355 Charles St. E. Kitchener N2G 2P8	W. A. Hunsberger	Dr. J. Melichercik
Wellington	The Children's Aid Society of the City of Guelph & the County of Wellington Box 1088 Guelph N1H 6N3	F. C. Promoli	Roy McLeod
York	Family & Children's Services 85 Eagle St. W. Newmarket L3Y 4X7	Gordon Cone	Elizabeth Errington
J.F. & C.S.	Jewish Family & Child Services 3101 Bathurst Street 5th Floor Toronto M6A 2A6	J. Diamond	Bernard S. Aaron

Children's Aid Societies
By Size of Population Served *

Small Societies (20,000- 60,000)	Medium Societies (60,000- 150,000)	Large Societies (150,000 and over)	Northern Societies
Bruce	Brant	Durham	Algoma
Dufferin	Elgin	Essex	Kapuskasing
Haldimand	Frontenac	Essex (R.C.)	Kenora
Huron	Grey	Halton	Muskoka
Lanark	Hastings	Hamilton	Nipissing
Lennox	JF & CS	Hamilton (R.C.)	Parry Sound
Norfolk	Kawartha	London	Porcupine
Prescott-Russell	Kent	Niagara	Rainy River
Prince Edward	Lambton	Ottawa	Sudbury
	Leeds	Peel	Timiskaming
	Northumberland	Toronto	Thunder Bay
	Oxford	Toronto (R.C.)	
	Perth	Waterloo	
	Renfrew	York	
	Simcoe		
	Stormont		
	Wellington		

* Based on OACAS Survey (1975). Since that time, Simcoe's population has grown to 208, 063. Other categories remain unchanged.

STUDY GROUP
ON
CHILD WELFARE IN ONTARIO

Survey Results

In June 1978, the study group requested and received the cooperation of the Children's Aid Societies in completing a written survey. Questions were designed to augment information found in the annual surveys conducted by OACAS. Results were used to construct a profile of Society Boards of Directors, membership, volunteers and fund-raising activities. They are presented below in summary form in categories based on the size of population served by Societies.

Survey deadline:

July 21, 1978

Response rate: 84.3%

Total replies:

43/51 Societies including 9/9 small, 11/17 medium, 12/14 large, and 11/11 northern Societies

I Board of Directors

	All		Small		Medium		Large		Northern	
%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
11-37 mbrs. 19.8 "		11-19 mbrs. 16.5 "		15-37 mbrs. 20 "		18-30 mbrs. 24 "		14-25 mbrs. 19.5 "		
5.7 yrs. 34.9 (16)		5.5 yrs. 33 (3)		5.6 yrs. 27 (3)		4.4 yrs. 25 (3)		6 yrs. 64 (7)		
1.3 yrs. 32.2 (16)		1 yr. 33 (3)		1 yr. 27 (3)		1 yr. 33 (4)		2.2 yrs. 54.6 (6)		

Range in size
Median size
Max. consecutive yrs.
in office
no policy
Required absence be-
fore next term
no policy

Maximum total years
permitted

10 yrs.
5 yrs.
no policy

Years of service:

0-3 yrs.
4-6 yrs.
7-9 yrs.
10-14 yrs.
15 yrs. or more

Total no. of Directors

Occupations of Board

Members

Managerial, Admin.
Homemaking
Teaching
Social Sciences
Retired
Medicine/Health
Agriculture

All		Small		Medium		Large		Northern	
%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
2.3	(1)	11.1	(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.3	(1)	-	-	9.1	(1)	-	-	-	-
88.4	(38)	66.7	(6)	90.9	(10)	91.7	(11)	100	(11)
59.7	(519)	71.2	(99)	59.1	(136)	56.5	(161)	57.2	(123)
19.5	(169)	17.3	(24)	16.1	(37)	25.6	(73)	16.3	(35)
7.3	(63)	7.2	(10)	4.8	(11)	8.4	(24)	8.4	(18)
3.7	(32)	.72	(1)	2.2	(5)	6	(17)	4.2	(9)
1.4	(12)	-	-	.87	(2)	1.4	(4)	2.8	(6)
869		139		230		285		215	
20.3	(176)	17.3	(24)	21.7	(50)	22.1	(63)	18.1	(39)
14.5	(126)	11.5	(16)	16.1	(37)	15.8	(45)	13	(28)
9.6	(83)	7.9	(11)	7.8	(18)	9.1	(26)	13	(28)
7.9	(69)	4.3	(6)	4.8	(11)	8.8	(25)	12.6	(27)
4.7	(41)	5	(6)	5.2	(12)	3.5	(10)	6	(13)
4.5	(39)	2.8	(4)	7	(16)	3.2	(9)	4.7	(10)
4.4	(38)	12	(18)	6.1	(14)	1.4	(4)	.93	(2)

	All			Small			Medium			Large			Northern		
	%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#	
Religion	4.1	(36)		2.8	(4)		3.5	(8)		3.9	(11)		6	(13)	
Sales	4	(35)		4.3	(6)		4.8	(11)		4.9	(14)		1.7	(4)	
Clerical	1.6	(14)		2.2	(3)		1.3	(3)		1.8	(5)		1.4	(2)	
Product Fabrication/ Assembly/Repair	1.5	(13)		2.2	(3)		2.6	(6)		.70	(2)		.93	(2)	
Artistic/Recreational	.81	(7)		.72	(1)		-	1		(3)	1.4		(3)		
Natural Sciences	.46	(4)		-	-		.87	(2)		.70	(2)		-	-	
Transport Equip. Operation	.23	(2)		-	-		-	-		-	-		.93	(2)	
Fishing/Hunting/ Trapping	.12	(1)		-	-		-	-		-	-		.47	(1)	
Mining/Quarrying	.12	(1)		-	-		-	-		-	-		.47	(1)	
Machining	.12	(1)		-	-		-	-		-	-		.47	(1)	
Construction Trades	.12	(1)		-	-		.43	(1)		-	-		-	-	
Unemployed	.12	(1)		-	-		-	-		.35	(1)		-	-	
Not known/stated	20.8	(181)		26.6	(37)		17.8	(41)		22.8	(65)		17.7	(38)	
Members with French as first language	4.5	(39)		10.1	(14)		.43	(1)		2.1	(6)		8.4	(18)	
Ethnic Origins -															
Anglo Saxon Cdn./ Brit./American	45.8	(398)		59.7	(83)		50.4	(116)		33.3	(95)		48.4	(104)	
Unknown	41.7	(362)		25.9	(36)		41.7	(96)		57.5	(164)		30.7	(66)	
French Canadian	5.2	(45)		10.1	(14)		1.3	(3)		2.5	(7)		9.8	(21)	
Native Canadian	1.3	(11)		.72	(1)		.43	(1)		-	-		4.2	(9)	
German	1	(9)		-	-		.87	(2)		1.8	(5)		.93	(2)	
Dutch	1	(9)		2.2	(3)		1.3	(3)		.70	(2)		.47	(1)	
Other European	1	(9)		.72	(1)		1.7	(4)		.35	(1)		1.4	(3)	
Italian	.92	(8)		-	-		.43	(1)		1.8	(5)		.93	(2)	
Other Ethnic	.92	(8)		-	-		1.3	(3)		1.4	(4)		.47	(1)	
Ukrainian	.69	(6)		.72	(1)		-	-		.35	(1)		1.9	(4)	
Jewish	.23	(2)		-	-		-	-		.35	(1)		.47	(1)	
Scandinavian	.23	(2)		-	-		.43	(1)		-	-		.47	(1)	

	All		Small		Medium		Large		Northern	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Societies which refused to answer.	18.6	(8)	-	-	1.3	(3)	1	(3)	.93	(2)
No. of members who are -										
municipal reps.	20.9	(182)	16.6	(37)	18.3	(42)	18.6	(53)	23.3	(50)
adoptive parents	12.9	(112)	9.4	(13)	13	(30)	14	(40)	13.5	(29)
foster parents	8.1	(70)	10.1	(14)	8.3	(19)	6	(17)	9.3	(20)
former consumers	2.8	(24)	.72	(1)	3.5	(8)	3.2	(9)	2.8	(6)
staff	1.3	(11)	-	-	1.3	(3)	1.8	(5)	1.4	(3)
consumers	.92	(8)	-	-	1.7	(4)	.70	(2)	.93	(2)
Bylaws requiring special representation on Board	9.3	(4)	-	-	18.2	(2)	8.3	(1)	9.1	(1)
Societies which confirm municipal representatives by election	58.1	(25)	55.6	(5)	72.7	(8)	66.7	(8)	36.4	(4)
Societies which have rejected municipal representatives	4.7	(2)	-	-	-	-	8.3	(1)	9.1	(1)
Methods of Board recruitment-										
individual approach	97.7	(42)	100	(9)	100	(11)	91.7	(11)	100	(11)
letter to members	60.5	(26)	55.6	(5)	54.6	(6)	83.3	(10)	45.5	(5)
community announcement	55.8	(24)	55.6	(5)	63.6	(7)	33.3	(4)	72.7	(8)
membership phoning	18.6	(8)	22.2	(2)	27.3	(3)	8.3	(1)	18.2	(2)
Methods of nomination -										
nominating committee	100	(43)	100	(9)	100	(11)	100	(12)	100	(11)
written nominations	81.4	(35)	66.7	(6)	90.9	(10)	83.3	(10)	81.8	(9)
nominations from floor	69.8	(30)	88.9	(8)	63.6	(7)	50	(6)	81.8	(9)

	All			Small			Medium			Large			Northern		
	%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#	
<u>No. of elections acclaimed since 1968 -</u>															
none acclaimed	16.3	(7)		11.1	(1)		27.3	(3)		8.3	(1)		18.2	(2)	
all acclaimed	39.5	(17)		33.3	(3)		54.6	(6)		50	(6)		18.2	(2)	
<u>Active Standing Committees</u>															
Services	93	(40)		77.8	(7)		100	(11)		91.7	(11)		100	(11)	
Personnel	90.7	(39)		77.8	(7)		100	(11)		91.7	(11)		90.9	(10)	
Finance	86.1	(37)		77.8	(7)		100	(11)		83.3	(10)		81.8	(9)	
Nominating	74.4	(32)		66.7	(6)		72.7	(8)		91.7	(11)		63.6	(7)	
Public Relations	72.1	(31)		55.6	(5)		90.9	(10)		91.7	(11)		45.5	(5)	
Property	69.8	(30)		55.6	(5)		63.6	(7)		75	(9)		81.8	(9)	
Membership	32.6	(14)		33.3	(3)		54.6	(6)		33.3	(4)		9.1	(1)	
Social Issues	18.6	(8)		22.2	(2)		9.1	(1)		25	(3)		18.2	(2)	
<u>No. of Boards with complaint committees</u>															
	20.9	(9)		33.3	(3)		36.3	(4)		-	-		18.2	(2)	
<u>Complaints handled by other mechanism</u>															
	7	(3)		22.2	(2)		9.1	(1)		-	-		-	-	
<u>Who may appeal?</u>															
Consumers	25.6	(11)		33.3	(3)		36.3	(4)		8.3	(1)		27.3	(2)	
Staff	27.9	(12)		44.4	(4)		36.3	(4)		8.3	(1)		27.3	(3)	
Volunteers	14	(6)		22.2	(2)		9.1	(1)		8.3	(1)		18.2	(2)	
<u>Total no. of complaints in last year</u>															
Consumers	8			2				3			2		1		
Staff	6			1				1			0		4		
Volunteers	0			0				0			0		0		

No mechanism for complaints to Board

Media Relations

Excellent
Good
Fair

Media Bd. mtg. attendance

frequent
infrequent
never
other

Board meetings open to

Board only
Society members
general public
no policy

Reps. from other agencies
at Board meetings

Board members at other
agencies' Boards

II Membership

Range in size

Median size

No. of staff who are
members

Total no. of members
(excluding Board)

Percentage of total

All			Small			Medium			Large			Northern		
%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#	
69.8	(30)		44.4	(4)		45.5	(5)		100	(12)		81.8	(9)	
30.2	(13)		44.4	(4)		27.3	(3)		25	(3)		27.3	(3)	
65.1	(28)		33.3	(3)		72.7	(8)		75	(9)		72.7	(8)	
4.7	(2)		22.2	(2)		-	-		-	-		-	-	
20.9	(9)		11.1	(1)		27.3	(3)		16.7	(2)		27.3	(3)	
27.9	(12)		33.3	(3)		27.3	(3)		25	(3)		27.3	(3)	
2.3	(1)		11.1	(1)		-	-		-	-		-	-	
46.5	(20)		44.4	(4)		45.5	(5)		50	(6)		45.5	(5)	
18.6	(8)		-	-		27.3	(3)		33.3	(4)		9.1	(1)	
16.3	(7)		22.2	(2)		27.3	(3)		8.3	(1)		9.1	(1)	
51.2	(22)		66.7	(6)		45.5	(5)		33.3	(4)		63.6	(7)	
9.3	(4)		11.1	(1)		-	-		8.3	(1)		18.2	(2)	
11.6	(5)		11.1	(1)		9.1	(1)		16.7	(2)		9.2	(1)	
46.5	(20)		33.3	(3)		36.3	(4)		58.3	(7)		54.6	(6)	
3-1500			10-227			3-800			4-1500			28-227		
76.5			66			76			195			67		
306			28			81			131			66		
7445			758			1476			4246			965		
100			10.2			19.8			57			13		

	All			Small			Medium			Large			Northern		
	%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#	
<u>Reasons for membership-</u>															
public relations	62.8	(27)		55.6	(5)		81.8	(9)		41.7	(5)		72.7	(8)	
help in work	11.6	(5)		11.1	(1)		9.1	(1)		16.7	(2)		9.1	(1)	
no answer	11.6	(5)		-	-		9.1	(1)		25	(3)		9.1	(1)	
not known	9.3	(4)		22.2	(2)		-	-		8.3	(1)		9.1	(1)	
required by law	4.7	(2)		11.1	(1)		-	-		8.3	(1)		-	-	
Board approval required for membership	27.9	(12)		33.3	(3)		18.2	(2)		41.7	(5)		18.2	(2)	
No. of Boards which have rejected applications	4.7	(2)		-	-		9.1	(1)		8.3	(1)		-	-	
<u>Bylaws prohibiting membership of -</u>															
minors	58.1	(25)		55.6	(5)		63.6	(7)		58.3	(7)		54.6	(6)	
non-residents	58.1	(25)		66.7	(6)		63.6	(7)		50	(6)		54.6	(6)	
staff	23.3	(10)		22.2	(2)		36.4	(4)		33.3	(4)		-	-	
<u>Communication with members through</u>															
special events	65.1	(28)		55.6	(5)		63.6	(7)		75	(9)		63.6	(7)	
newsletter	51.2	(22)		55.6	(5)		36.4	(4)		75	(9)		36.4	(4)	
Board minutes	9.3	(4)		22.2	(2)		9.1	(1)		8.3	(1)		-	-	
No. of Societies which offer membership orientation	27.9	(12)		22.2	(2)		27.3	(3)		50	(6)		9.1	(1)	

	All			Small			Medium			Large			Northern		
	%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#	
III Volunteers															
Range in no. of volunteers		0-640			1-60			0-108			44-640			0-30	
Median no. (excluding Board)		20.2			10			9			65			5	
Less than 10 volunteers reported	30.2	(13)		55.6	(5)		45.5	(5)		-	-		27.3	(3)	
No volunteers reported	7	(3)		-	-		9.1	(1)		-	-		18.2	(2)	
No answer	11.6	(5)		11.1	(1)		9.1	(1)		8.3	(1)		18.2	(2)	
Total No. of Volunteers	2259		156			236			90	1777					
Percentage of total		100		6.9		10.5			4	78.7					
<u>Length of service</u>															
less than 1 year	21.7	(491)		20.5	(32)		31.8	(75)		20.7	(368)		17.8	(16)	
1 - 2 years	19	(429)		15.4	(24)		28	(66)		18.4	(327)		13.3	(12)	
3 - 4 years	12.6	(285)		19.2	(30)		24.2	(57)		11	(196)		2.2	(2)	
5 - 10 years	8.1	(182)		7.1	(11)		12.3	(29)		7.4	(132)		11.1	(10)	
10 years plus	2	(45)		4.5	(7)		3.8	(9)		1.6	(29)		-	-	
no breakdown available	36.6	(827)		33.3	(52)		-	-		40.8	(725)		55.6	(50)	
<u>Volunteer orientation</u>															
held	65.1	(28)		66.7	(6)		54.6	(6)		91.7	(11)		45.5	(5)	
Volunteer Coordinator	46.5	(20)		33.3	(3)		45.5	(5)		100	(12)		-	-	
full-time staff	23.3	(10)		11.1	(1)		18.2	(2)		58.3	(7)		-	-	
part-time staff	16.3	(7)		11.1	(1)		18.2	(2)		33.3	(4)		-	-	
part-time volunteer	4.7	(2)		-	-		9.1	(1)		8.3	(1)		-	-	
not stated	2.3	(1)		2.3	(1)		-	-		-	-		-	-	
Active recruitment of volunteers in past year	55.8	(24)		22.2	(2)		36.4	(4)		100	(12)		54.6	(6)	

IV Budget Information

No. of Child Welfare Review Board hearings in past 10 years.

	All		Small		Medium		Large		Northern	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
76.7	(33)		88.9	(9)	81.8	(9)	66.7	(8)	72.7	(8)
18.6	(8)		-	-	9.1	(1)	33.3	(4)	27.3	(3)
2.3	(1)		-	-	9.1	(1)	-	-	-	-
2.3	(1)		11.1	(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-

No. of Societies receiving additional government grants.

	All		Small		Medium		Large		Northern	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
2.3	(1)		-	-	-	-	8.3	(1)	-	-
4.7	(2)		-	-	-	-	16.7	(2)	-	-
-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.7	(2)		-	-	-	-	16.7	(2)	-	-
7	(3)		-	-	9.1	(1)	16.7	(2)	-	-
7	(3)		-	-	9.1	(1)	16.7	(2)	-	-
16.3	(7)		11.1	(1)	9.1	(1)	25	(3)	18.2	(2)
23.3	(10)		11.1	(1)	36.3	(4)	25	(3)	18.2	(2)
30.2	(13)		22.2	(2)	27.3	(3)	50	(6)	18.2	(2)
37.2	(16)		22.2	(2)	18.2	(2)	58.3	(7)	45.5	(5)

	All			Small			Medium			Large			Northern		
	%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#		%	#	
16.3	(7)		11.1	(1)		9.1	(1)		41.7	(5)		-	-		
18.6	(8)		11.1	(1)		9.1	(1)		41.7	(5)		9.1	(1)		
18.6	(8)		22.2	(2)		9.1	(1)		33.3	(4)		9.1	(1)		
18.6	(8)		22.2	(2)		9.1	(1)		41.7	(5)		-	-		
20.9	(9)		22.2	(2)		9.1	(1)		50	(6)		-	-		
23.3	(10)		33.3	(3)		18.2	(2)		41.7	(5)		-	-		
23.3	(10)		33.3	(3)		9.1	(1)		41.7	(5)		9.1	(1)		
23.3	(10)		44.4	(4)		9.1	(1)		41.7	(5)		-	-		
23.3	(10)		33.3	(3)		9.1	(1)		50	(6)		-	-		
25.6	(11)		44.4	(4)		9.1	(1)		50	(6)		-	-		
39.5	(7)		44.4	(4)		27.3	(3)		41.7	(5)		45.5	(5)		

No. of Societies actively
soliciting non-gov't
grants

Questionnaire completed by

Local Director	53.5	(23)	44.4	(4)	36.3	(4)	50	(6)	81.8	(9)
President	23.3	(10)	44.4	(4)	27.3	(3)	25	(3)	-	-
L. D./Pres.	7	(3)	-	-	9.1	(1)	8.3	(1)	9.1	(1)
Other	16.2	(7)	11.1	(1)	27.3	(3)	16.7	(2)	9.1	(1)

Children in Care - March 1977 -

Province or Territory	Total Population Under 18 years *	No. of Children in Care **	Percentage of Total	Ratio Per Thousand
Newfoundland	284,895	1,435	0.5	5:1000
Prince Edward Island	41,270	277	0.7	7:1000
Nova Scotia	276,655	3,110	1.1	11:1000
New Brunswick	237,875	2,752	1.2	12:1000
Quebec	1,954,700	33,353	1.7	17:1000
Ontario	2,567,920	13,112	0.5	5:1000
Manitoba	326,315	3,820	1.2	12:1000
Saskatchewan	556,015	2,715	0.5	5:1000
Alberta	620,090	8,762	1.4	14:1000
British Columbia	741,775	9,469	1.3	13:1000
Northwest Territories	19,135	441	2.3	23:1000
Yukon	7,735	194	2.5	25:1000
TOTAL	7,634,380	79,440	1.0	10:1000

* Statistics Canada, Population by Age and Sex: 1976 Census of Canada January 12, 1978.

** Unpublished figures from Social Services Program Branch, Health and Welfare Canada, July 19, 1977. Includes children taken into care through court order, voluntary agreement, consent to adoption and transfer of custody. Figures may vary according to definition of categories. The reported total for Quebec, for example, includes 26,049 physically and mentally handicapped and socially maladjusted children. Some provinces include native children; others do not.

List of Consultations

The study group consulted with a selected number of organizations and individuals whom we believed represented specific interests related to child welfare or had particular expertise in certain areas under study. We thank them for their contributions.

George Caldwell, Executive Director, Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies

The Child Welfare League of America

Children's Services Division, Ministry of Community and Social Services

Howard Clifford, Social Services Division, Health and Welfare Canada

Directors of Child Welfare and their staffs in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia

H.H. Dymond, former Executive Director, Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies

The Foster Parents' Association of Ontario

Philip Hepworth, former Program Director of Personal Social Services, Canadian Council on Social Development

Terrance Hunsley, Director, Social Services Division, Health and Welfare Canada

Peter Klute, Deputy Director, Association of Municipalities of Ontario

Mona Nelson, National Coordinator, International Year of the Child, Health and Welfare Canada

Marvyn Novick, Senior Program Director, Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto

Sheila Richardson, Executive Director, Association of Counties and Regions in Ontario

Toronto Jewish Congress, Social Policy Committee

Responding to this Paper

To ensure your response to this paper is properly recorded and distributed, please complete the Summary Sheet (next page) and send it along with your submission to:

Consultation Task Force
12th Floor
700 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1E9

Deadline for responses is December 28, 1979.

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION PAPER
SUMMARY SHEET

SUBMITTED BY

(Name and address
of individual
or group)

Contact Person Title Phone Number

Sponsored by (if different than above, or if by more than one group/individual)

1.
2.
- (use back of form, if required)

TITLE:

ISSUES:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

OFFICE USE ONLY

Date Received Date Referred Referred to



3 1761 11546581 7